

AUG 8 1935

INDEXED

351

The SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY

JULY, 1935

*DA

Leftward Ho!

Roger Shaw

Education and Social Change

Newton Edwards

Early Labor Organization in North Carolina, 1880-1900

H. M. Douty

Ecclesiastic Anvils of Peace

Harold P. Marley

The Public Utility Holding Company in Theory
and Practice

Norman S. Buchanan

French and English Mutual Analyses

Geraldine P. Dilla

The Temperance Movement in North Carolina

D. J. Whitener

Some Recent Changes in the College Curriculum

Edgar W. Knight

Book Reviews

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY FOR
THE SOUTH ATLANTIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
BY THE DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C., U. S. A.

The South Atlantic Quarterly

FOUNDED IN 1902 BY THE 9019 SCHOLARSHIP SOCIETY OF TRINITY COLLEGE

OFFICERS

Robert L. Flowers, Pres.

Albert M. Wahl, Vice-Pres.

D. W. Newsom, Sec.-Treas.

DIRECTORS

W. F. Few, Wm. H. Clason, K. L. Flowers, Wm. H. Wannamaker, D. W. Newsom, W. E. Boyd

Editorial Board: William H. Wannamaker William T. LaPrade
Newman I. White and Calvin B. Hoover

Managing Editor: Henry R. Dwire

Communications in regard to articles, book reviews and editorial matters should be addressed to Managing Editor, THE SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY, Duke University, Durham, N. C. While reasonable diligence is observed, the return of unsolicited manuscripts is not guaranteed. Subscriptions and all communications relating to advertisements and business matters should be addressed to Duke University Press, Durham, N. C. The Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London, E. C. 4: agents in Great Britain and Ireland. Subscription rates on application.

IN THIS ISSUE

	PAGE
LEFTWARD HO!.....	Roger Shaw 237
EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE.....	Newton Edwards 244
EARLY LABOR ORGANIZATION IN NORTH CAROLINA 1880-1900.....	H. M. Douty 260
ECCLESIASTIC ANVILS OF PEACE.....	Harold P. Marley 269
THE PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY IN THEORY AND PRACTICE.....	Norman S. Buchanan 282
FRENCH AND ENGLISH MUTUAL ANALYSES....	Geraldine P. Dilla 293
THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA.....	D. J. Whitener 305
SOME RECENT CHANGES IN THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM.....	Edgar W. Knight 314
COMMENTS ON BOOKS:	
Criticism of the Constitution.....	John J. Corson, III 333
A Confederate Problem.....	R. H. Woody 335
The France of Rabelais.....	E. C. Knowlton 337
Early Career of a Minor Poet.....	Clarence Goldes 338
Descriptive Verse.....	E. C. Knowlton 339
Portrait of a Lady.....	E. C. Knowlton 340
Critic without Portfolio.....	E. C. Knowlton 341
Chamberlain at His Height.....	W. T. LaPrade 342
Books with Kindred Purpose.....	E. C. Knowlton 343
Philosophy and a Poet.....	W. T. LaPrade 344

Contents of previous issues of The South Atlantic Quarterly can be found by consulting the INTERNATIONAL INDEX in your library.

Issued in the Months of January, April, July, and October.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Postoffice at Durham, N. C.

Copyright, 1935, by Duke University Press

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

ROGER SHAW, of Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, attended Princeton, Johns Hopkins, and Columbia. He is foreign editor of *Review of Reviews*, trustee of Rollins College, author of books on revolution and government, and contributor to English, French, and German periodicals.

NEWTON EDWARDS, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, is a native of Carthage, North Carolina. After completing his undergraduate work at the University of South Carolina, he received his A.M. degree from Columbia and his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. Professor Edwards is the author of *The Courts and the Public Schools*, the editor of the *Elementary School Journal*, and a contributor to various educational journals.

H. M. DOUTY, A.B., Duke, 1932; M.A., Columbia, 1932; research assistant, Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1933-1934, at present instructor in economics in the University of North Carolina, has contributed articles to the *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *Social Forces*, *The Southwest Review*, *The Nation*, and other journals.

HAROLD P. MARLEY, Minister of Unitarian Church in Ann Arbor, Michigan, graduated from Union Theological Seminary in New York and preached in Brooklyn; Greensboro, North Carolina; and Toledo, Ohio. He has done extensive social service work in connection with his ministry, including rehabilitation projects of Quakers in coal fields. He is a contributor to *Survey Graphic*, *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, and a number of religious periodicals, including the *Christian Century* and the *New Humanist*.

NORMAN S. BUCHANAN is Assistant Professor of Economics in Colgate University. Prior to 1930 he was an instructor in economics in Cornell University from which he received his Ph.D. degree in 1931. He has written other articles on the utility question for the *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*, the *Journal of Business of the University of Chicago*, and the *Journal of Political Economy*.

GERALDINE P. DILLA, Ph.D., formerly associate professor at Hollins College, Virginia, now teaches the history of art and literature in the new University of Kansas City, Missouri. Besides much travel in Europe with study in both Paris and London, she has conducted ten annual European tours. This summary of her doctoral dissertation is her third appearance in our pages.

D. J. WHITENER is Professor of History at Appalachian State Teachers College. He holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of North Carolina, and is an interesting and effective writer on historical subjects.

EDGAR W. KNIGHT, educated at Trinity College (now Duke University) and at Columbia University, is now Professor of Education in the University of North Carolina. He is the author of a number of important works on the history of education in the South and a frequent contributor to magazines on educational and social subjects. In the January issue of *The South Atlantic Quarterly* appeared his article, "Some Early Discussions of the College Curriculum."

AWAY FROM THE HEAT AND HURRY OF THE CITY



Well-known to the city dweller is the longing for green fields and growing things. For the peace and comfort of a house by the side of a road. Where the air is fresh and clean and tall trees shade the day. The telephone has helped to make that dream come true for countless men and women.

Long miles may separate office and home, yet you are never far away. The telephone puts you near to everybody and everything.

Telephone service like this is the result of years of co-ordinated effort by the Bell System. Bell Telephone Laboratories contribute their research and engineering. Western Electric its manufacturing, purchasing and distributing. The twenty-four regional telephone companies, with the assistance of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, see to it that the latest improvements in the art are made available to all.



BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Vol. XXXIV

JULY, 1935

Number 3

LEFTWARD HO!

ROGER SHAW

"A little more to the left, your majesty, a little more to the left," urged Karl Hjalmar Branting, socialist premier of Sweden. Old King Gustav V was a famous tennis player. "You know I always try to keep on the right side of the court," he replied cheerfully. But the two got on splendidly together. . . .

SINCE the advent of the New Deal two new political terms have appeared in the American press: right and left. They have been in general use in Europe for a century and a half, with very real significance. But in the United States they have hitherto been studiously eschewed, because of their foreign smack, and because their use indicated a bitter factionalism which we like to think is absent from the American political arena. Americans have a peculiar horror of class warfare.

American political struggles were, before the great depression, largely sectional. Between 1820 and 1860 there was the struggle between Northern free-soil and Southern slavery, which culminated in the great Civil War that disgraced the nation for half a decade. After the war the sectional struggle continued in the guise of a big-business high-tariff North as against an agrarian low-tariff South and West, with such issues as free silver and trust-busting interjected for additional entertainment. It was largely after 1929 that the United States became class-conscious in the European sense.

The presidential election of 1932 was admittedly a contest between the conservative right, under Herbert Hoover, and

the liberal left, led by Franklin Roosevelt. The result was a complete victory for the left, and the mid-term elections of 1934 amplified the leftist verdict. The New Deal was essentially a left product, in the European sense, and was as such defied by the rightist proponents of rugged American individualism. The vital issue was the question of mass unemployment, with maximum aid as a leftist plank, and minimum aid as the program of the right. This less sympathetic attitude toward the unemployed also characterized rightists across the Atlantic, as typified by the British National government and German nazis.

The New Dealers introduced a number of European leftist measures, in addition to their liberal unemployment policies. The minimum wage, regulated hours of labor, women in important public posts, social insurance and pensions, recognition of Russia, anti-imperialism, the use of brain-trusters, friendship with the trade unions, all were leaves borrowed from the European leftist textbook, as was a certain sock-the-rich attitude of mind which tended to color decisions at Washington. At the extreme left sat the hoary ghost of Dr. Karl Marx, and American rightists pointed horrified fingers in that direction and whispered of Comrade Roosevelt and his insidious Jewish advisers. Richberg, of course, turned out to be a Swede, while many of the Harvard brainy-ones were Puritanical Mayflowers.

Right and left originated in the French National Assembly of 1789 and thereafter. Nobles occupied the extreme rightwing seats of the Versailles palace, with clergy in the right-center, and commoners perched on the left. From that day to this, right has meant the fine people, while left has been applied to the masses: the "haves" versus the "have-nots." In the course of the next few years in France the extreme left seats were occupied by radical Jacobins, who were republicans, nationalists, economic individualists, and freethinkers in religious matters. They were the Bolsheviks of 1792, and their leaders were Danton, Robespierre, and Marat, who was the

authentic father of yellow journalism with his vitriolic *Ami du Peuple*.

The Jacobins were nicknamed "men of the mountains" since the assembly halls were steeply banked, and these reds (in their loose pantaloons and jaunty liberty caps) sat high up in the top left tiers and galleries. They were heartily opposed by the rightist whites, so-called because white was the historic color of the Bourbon dynasty, with its white flags and liveries. To this day right is white, and left is red or at least pinkish in hue.

During the French revolutionary period in America the followers of Hamilton were of the right, while those of Jefferson were leftists, although such terms were never used. Hamiltonians believed in a strong central government, rule by the rich and the wise, high tariffs, censorship of speech and press, and restricted immigration. Many of them were lukewarm republicans, and some had been Tories in 1776. Jeffersonians, on the other hand, were great believers in individual liberty, in states' rights as against centralized authority, in the innate republican virtue of the masses, in immigration, and in tariffs for revenue only. The Hamiltonian aristocrats (rich and wise) were admirers of aristocratic England, while the democratic Jeffersonians supported the kindred reds of revolutionary France. The "Hams" wore silk stockings and knee-breeches, while the "Jeffs" affected liberty caps and the loose long pants of the Parisian sans-culottes. Not again until 1932 were American left and right so clearly marked as in this Hamilton-Jefferson conflict. Jeffersonians and Jacobins were in close touch, and the latter were accused by Washington of fomenting the troublesome whiskey rebellion in Western Pennsylvania. Red propaganda at an early date?

In the course of the nineteenth century the parliamentary system began to develop in Western Europe along English and American lines, and the several political parties ranged themselves in seat-blocs according to their varying degrees of radicalism. Aristocrats and believers in autocracy sat on the right, while democratic liberals and individualists sat on the

left, shading off according to the intensity of their views. In England, for example, Conservatives represented the right, Liberals represented the left, and rabid Irish nationalists represented the extreme left. In Germany feudal Junkers were rightists, clerical Catholics were centrists, and progressives and socialists were leftists. In France, after 1870, clerical monarchists were on the right, and anti-clerical republicans were on the left. Populists and Greenbackers constituted a sort of unwitting American left through two decades.

Then came the World War, and an extraordinary reversal of right and left platforms and programs. Right and rich were still synonymous, as were left and poor. But the means had changed, although the ends were the same as heretofore.

Traditionally the right had believed in an all-powerful central government, based on feudal relics and established churches. Rightists had been opposed to rugged individualism and personal liberties, and they were cosmopolitan, pacific, and international in their outlook. The eighteenth-century gentleman was in no sense a nationalist, for he was anywhere elegantly at home, *a la* Chesterfield or Metternich. The autocratic, religious, but internationalistic, Holy Alliance exemplified the original rightist viewpoint.

The original left, dating from the French Revolution, was capitalistic and extremely individualistic, with a detestation of autocratic central authority by monarch, dictator, or regulatory bureaucracy. It was only too patriotic and nationalist, and disliked the aristocratic pacifism which opposed the wars of Napoleon and Carnot. Above all, the left favored government out of business, and economic *laissez-faire*, and the career open to talent. Its rationalist philosophers believed in natural laws, both for people and for things.

But with the twentieth century, and the increasing influence of Marxian collectivism, positions were being reversed. The rightist rich had turned from feudalism to big business, and economic *laissez-faire* was indispensable for money-making. The possession of natural resources, as aids to manufacturing, and the quest for colonies made for aggressive

foreign policies and almost universal militarism and navalism. Aggressive nationalism and imperialism became rightist planks, combined with that individualism which was formerly the property of the left.

Meanwhile, the left was becoming increasingly Marxian. It began to advocate the strong central government and the regulatory paternalism once espoused by the right, and some communists were almost feudal in their viewpoint. Marx was a pacifist and an internationalist, who urged the workers of the world to unite as professional proletarians. The pinks and reds ceased to be bellicose nationalists like their spiritual forebears of 1792, and abandoned patriotism to the hated right. In every country, during the World War, right literally kicked left into the trenches. Here was a complete historical somersault.

After the war the extreme left triumphed in Russia and set up a dictatorship of the proletariat which considered even socialists as dangerous rightists. The extreme right triumphed in Italy, and later in Germany, and even moderate conservatives were branded as malevolent leftists. Rightist nazis and leftist communists considered one another as sub-human species, and yet their methods were much the same. In England, France, and Scandinavia right and left continued their parliamentary battles in a better humor, like baseball teams alternating at bat. Such weak-kneed toleration was laughed to scorn by both nazis and communists. The nazis were a perfect example of the great reversal. With their strong nationalism and neo-pagan affinities, they would have sat on the extreme left in any French revolutionary assembly. But in the post-war Reichstags, with their beliefs, they sat on the extreme right!

But where a country is exclusively left, like Soviet Russia, or completely right, like the Third Reich, left must of necessity borrow planks from right, and right from left. International-minded Russia has now an army of a million men, and is becoming increasingly nationalistic in temper, as it worries less and less about the oppressed proletarians of Manhattan

or Shanghai. The nazis, financed by rightist plutocrats, have a state monopoly on foreign trade and on the labor of those under twenty-five years of age—all through sheer force of chance. Furthermore, there are right and left wings within both the communist and nazi parties, although the nazi left is many degrees to the right of the communist right.

Both nazis and communists, again, have atheistic tendencies. But the nazis have a rightist atheism which looks back to the traditional Thor and Wotan, while the communists have a leftist atheism of materialistic content which looks forward with Robert Ingersoll. Wotan is white, and Ingersoll is red, in terms of the political rainbow.

Jews are generally leftists, since they have always been among the oppressed. Even when they have achieved wealth, they are inclined to retain their inherent sympathy for the masses. They were instrumental in the formation of red Russia, with Marx as their prophet, and Disraeli is only an exception that goes to prove the rule. Rightists of all countries in all ages, from medieval barons and Russian Tsars down to nazis and non-New Dealers, have had anti-semitic tendencies. "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion"—still believed in by many—became a sort of bible for the right elements in many countries, and the so-called "Jewish Republic of Russia" has become a byword. According to some of the right-minded of 1935, the only bad capitalists are Jewish capitalists. According to many of the left-minded, the only bad Jews are capitalistic Jews.

Right and left, as terms, are also applied to religion with regard to relative orthodoxy. Thus the Roman Catholics are to the left of the Greek Orthodox creed, with the Protestants to the left of the Catholics, and the Mormons and Holy Rollers to the left of the Salvation Army, which is to the left of the Presbyterians and Episcopalians! Perhaps the extreme left, evangelically speaking, is occupied by Aimee Semple McPherson and her sunny California cohorts of the temple. Within the Protestant fold in America, the extreme right is certainly marshaled by Bishop William T. Manning. Aimee and the

bishop, however, could hardly be expected to sit in the same parliament or chapel, even at opposite ends of the house. Doubtless they require for their existence two different mediums, as do beasts and fish.

America, beyond a doubt, is becoming politically conscious of left and right. One reads in the daily press of how the left was worsted by the late N. R. A. decision, and of how Huey Long from the extreme left threatens that left-centrist, President Roosevelt. Once the dole was considered a leftist plank, but today it is the right that advocates it for America, since the leftist works-relief program adopted by the President will prove vastly more expensive. And so it goes merrily and forever on.

To quote the terse phraseology of the redundant communists, Is the New Deal "left-wing deviationism" or is it merely "liquidation of the kulaks"? Your rightist believes that it is both.

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE*

NEWTON EDWARDS

EDUCATION in this country is being forced inescapably to play a new rôle in the life of the nation. Social forces playing upon the school from without, forces over which educators themselves have little or no control, are requiring the school to re-examine some of the basic tenets of its philosophy, to assume new and enlarged social obligations, to modify and enrich its instructional content, and to cast its structural organization in a new mold. The purpose of this discussion is to direct attention to some of these forces and to indicate something of their educational implications.

POPULATION GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION

Changes in growth and distribution of population have had, and no doubt will continue to have, a very vital effect upon educational policy. A declining birth-rate and a declining death-rate have had the effect of reducing materially the percentage of young persons in the population. We are, in fact, developing a social pattern in which youth plays an increasingly less conspicuous rôle. This changing ratio of youth to adults has been characteristic of American society for more than a century, but it has been particularly noticeable during the past few decades. In 1840, for every 1,000 white children under sixteen years of age, there were 989 white adults, an adult being defined as a person twenty years of age or over. In 1900, for every 1,000 children, there were 1,583 adults, and by 1930 the number of adults for each 1,000 children had increased to 2,013. If the ratio of children to adults had been the same in 1930 as it was in 1850, society would have had the burden of supporting and caring for approximately 60,000,000 children instead of 33,000,000, as was actually the case. Thus society's burden in

* This address was delivered by Dr. Edwards at a meeting of the Duke chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, on Wednesday evening, April 10, 1935.

caring for its young dependents was relatively little more than half as great in 1930 as it was in 1850. If we divide the population into two groups, those below and those above twenty years of age, we note the same general tendency. In 1850, 52.5 per cent of the population was under twenty years of age; in 1930 this age-group comprised only 38.8 per cent of the total population. Moreover, the evidence clearly indicates that for several decades to come the percentage of young persons in the population will steadily decline. Careful estimates of future population trends indicate that persons under twenty years of age will comprise 34.6 per cent of the population in 1940, 31.3 per cent in 1950, 29.4 per cent in 1960, and 27.6 per cent in 1970.

This decline in the percentage of children and young persons in the population is of great educational significance. It means that the period of childhood and dependency is being extended, that society, having relatively fewer children to support and educate, is able to take a new attitude toward childhood and to afford its youth extended and enriched educational opportunities. It means, moreover, that the burden of productive labor is being shifted from the shoulders of youth to the shoulders of adults. Never before in human history has youth participated so little in the productive work of the world, and never before has youth found it necessary to acquire such a large part of its training in educational institutions of a formal type. Paradoxical as it may seem, there can be little doubt that the remarkable expansion of education in recent years at the secondary and college levels is in no small measure due to the decline of the child population. The explanation of this paradox, if indeed it be a paradox, lies in the fact that a decrease in the percentage of children in the population results in an increase in the percentage of children attending school. Not infrequently one hears the suggestion that the popularization of education at the upper levels is a mistaken policy, that in some way we should limit high school and college enrolment. Those who would carry these suggestions into effect are without doubt faced with the difficulty of

discovering some means of reversing trends in population growth.

The unequal distribution of young dependents as between geographical areas constitutes another aspect of population growth which vitally affects educational policy. The educational burden of the most productive age-group, that is to say, the age-group of twenty to forty-four, is much greater in certain sections of the country than in others. The very great fecundity of the Southern states results in their having to bear a disproportionately heavy educational burden. Each 100 adults in the most productive age-group in the South has to assume responsibility for the education of 122 persons under the age of twenty. In the West, for each 100 persons in the most productive age-group, there are only 87 persons under twenty years of age. In the Northeast the ratio is 100 to 91, and in the North Center, 100 to 96. "The productive workers in the South carry a burden of about two-fifths more young dependents than the workers in the West and about one-third more than those in the Northeast and North Center."¹ Obviously the maintenance of an educational system in the South comparable with that of other sections entails the making of extraordinary sacrifices.

The unequal distribution of young dependents between geographical sections is paralleled by a similar unequal distribution as between city and country. It is a significant fact that the urban population of this country is materially failing to reproduce itself; and, if it were not for the fecundity of rural areas, the population of most urban communities would undergo an immediate and material shrinkage. In 1930 the larger cities of this country were failing to maintain a stationary population by at least 20 per cent, and even in smaller communities down to 2,500 the deficit averaged 7 per cent. The effective fertility of farm women, on the other hand, was sufficient to supply a natural increase of from 50 to 60 per cent per generation. Obviously these variations in the rate of

¹ Warren S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton, *Population Trends in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1933), p. 124.

reproduction create unequal burdens of child care and education. As a matter of fact, "if country children were to receive educational advantages equal to those enjoyed by the average city child, the tax burden for educational purposes would have to be at least 50 per cent higher at present for the average rural adult than for the average city dweller."²

The unequal distribution of the child population as between country and city and as between geographical sections would seem to make necessary increased state and federal support of a national education program. After all, child welfare, especially the education of youth, is not essentially a local or community responsibility. It would be a most mistaken policy to permit those communities of the nation which have to bear a relatively light burden of child support to escape responsibility for the education of youth in communities where the burden of child care is disproportionately heavy. In this connection, moreover, the fact cannot be overlooked that rural communities care for and educate large numbers of persons who later migrate to the cities. This is particularly true of the rural South. During the decade from 1920 to 1930 Southern farms alone provided 60 per cent of all migrants from farm to city. If \$2,000 be allowed as the cost of caring for and educating a child until the age of fifteen, the rural farm population of the Southern states, in the decade 1920 to 1930, contributed approximately seven billion dollars to urban communities of the nation, both north and south. On the same basis and for the same period, the contribution to urban communities of the entire farm population of the country was approximately ten billion dollars. Nor is that the whole story. When farmers grow old or die, and their estates are settled, a considerable proportion of their wealth is passed on to children who have migrated to the city. It is difficult, of course, to determine accurately the exact amount of wealth which passes from country to city by the settlement of estates, but on the basis of the best estimates it was no less than four billion dollars for the decade ending in 1930. It is estimated, too,

² Frank Lorimer and Frederick Osborn, *Dynamics of Population*, p. 37.

that in the course of a generation from a quarter to half of the total value of farm property will be transferred to city owners by the settlement of estates. It should be pointed out, too, that there is no comparable counterflow of wealth from city to country. Without doubt the rural youth of the nation have a moral claim to enough of the national income to insure for them educational opportunities at least somewhat comparable to those enjoyed by city youth.

There is another phase of population growth which is not without educational significance. I refer to the differential in reproduction rates among groups of varying cultural and intellectual status. Attention has already been called to the fact that fertility in cities of 2,500 population and over is not sufficient to maintain existing population levels and that fertility among farm women is sufficient to produce a surplus of from 50 to 60 per cent. As Lorimer and Osborn have conclusively shown, "the only groups in the United States which are at present reproducing at rates far above actual replacement needs," are located in rural areas, and they are located predominately in those areas where economic conditions are poorest and where the cultural-intellectual level is lowest. Moreover, within cities there is a marked difference in fertility among the various social classes. Lorimer and Osborn comment on this difference as follows: "And within the towns and cities, the lower occupational groups, especially those in marginal economic circumstances, and dependent groups, characterized by low ratings as regards cultural-intellectual development, are commonly found to have birth-rates somewhat above replacement needs and far above the birth-rate characteristic of neighboring groups with superior advantages. At the same time there is hardly a single urban group in which the majority of the young people enjoy the advantages of high school education and in which many continue their education through college that is now replacing itself from one generation to another."³ To be more specific, families of the professional class in this country are failing by

³ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

about 25 per cent to have enough children for family replacement, whereas families in the unskilled labor group are having about 15 per cent more children than is needed for family replacement. I do not wish to be understood as saying that every parent is a moron, but there is abundant evidence to indicate that those groups in American society which have the highest cultural resources are failing to have enough children to replace themselves, and that we are disproportionately recruiting future generations from those rural and urban families whose level of cultural and intellectual development is low as measured by existing indices.

Obviously the tendency to recruit the population reserves of the nation from those groups having the poorest economic, social, and educational background measurably increases the social obligations of the American educational system. A society exhibiting the kind of population drift which our society exhibits has no choice other than to attempt to counteract the social consequences of this drift through conscious educative endeavor. Seemingly there is no other way to advance our cultural level or to make secure representative institutions. These are facts which should be pondered long and well by critics of the American educational system who are disposed to reduce its resources or to limit the scope of its social responsibility.

The increasing mobility of population in this country gives rise to a number of significant educational problems. From the earliest days of settlement we have been a restless, moving people. Few migrations in history have been comparable with the settlement of our West. But it is not this Western movement with which we are here concerned. Attention is directed rather to the more recent drift of population from state to state and from country to city. By 1870 migration from state to state had begun to decrease, no doubt because of the passing of the frontier, but by 1910 the movement of population from the country to the city had begun to accelerate mobility. It is a most significant fact that mobility of population, measured

by the percentage of population born in states other than state of residence, was approximately as great in 1930 as it was in 1850. In other words, the city today has as much pulling power as had cheap land and the frontier in 1850. These data merely indicate the extent of migration from state to state. No doubt the degree of mobility from community to community within states is even greater.

The educational consequences of this mobility of population are obvious. It makes education more definitely a state or even a national concern. No community and no state which is concerned with its own safety and welfare can be indifferent to the type of educational opportunities afforded youth in any other community or state. This fact means that in the future education will, in all probability, draw its support in increasing measure from state and national sources. Moreover, a mobile population requires a type of curriculum which will prepare youth, not merely for life in the local community, but for living in other sections of the country. It lays on the school, too, increased responsibility for the intelligent guidance of pupils.

EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN FROM GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT

No discussion of the educational implications of recent social change would be complete which failed to call attention to the tendency in recent years to exclude youth from gainful employment. The rapid expansion of industry in this country during the last quarter of the nineteenth century resulted in the gainful employment of a considerable percentage of young persons, even of children under the age of fifteen. In 1910, for example, 18.4 per cent of the children between ten and fifteen years of age were gainfully employed. Beginning about 1910, however, industry itself seems to have discovered that the employment of young children was no longer profitable. However that may be, one notes about that date a sudden and perceptible decline in the employment of children.

During the twenty-year period from 1910 to 1930 the number of children ten to fifteen years of age gainfully employed decreased from 18.4 to 4.7 per cent. Moreover, there has been in recent years a marked decline in the employment of young people at the upper age levels.

There are a number of reasons why young persons are being increasingly excluded from gainful occupation. Attention has already been called to the fact that we are developing a society of elders. Youth who seek employment inevitably are thrown into competition with an increasing number of adults. Perhaps of even greater importance has been the mechanization of the processes of production. Youth as well as adults are experiencing the consequences of technological unemployment. Moreover, in many of our industrial plants we are developing a type of machinery the operation of which cannot be entrusted to immature persons. Another significant factor is that industry itself is demanding higher educational qualifications of its employees.

It is obvious that we are developing an economic structure which makes it increasingly difficult for youth to participate in productive labor. It ought to be equally obvious that the exclusion of youth from gainful employment has had profound influence on the development of the American educational system. One consequence has been the popularization of education, the expansion of high-school and college enrollment, far beyond that known in other countries. Indeed, the exclusion of youth from industry is forcing the schools, and to some extent the colleges, to become in a sense custodial institutions, for a society—certainly an urban, industrial society—which cannot provide employment for its youth, must in some fashion provide means of preventing them from drifting into idleness and crime. The expanded educational program of this country is evidence that society has discovered that the school is the one institution which may be most successfully employed to safeguard youth in a period of rapid economic and social change.

THE EFFECT OF ADVANCING TECHNOLOGY ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The social obligation of the school is being materially increased by the rapid advance of technology and the resulting changes in modes of production and in the employment of labor. Despite the increase in industrial output in recent years, there has been a marked decrease in the number of persons employed in manufacturing and agricultural enterprises. There may be ground for difference of opinion with respect to the general economic and social significance of technological unemployment, but the educational implications of technological advance are obvious.

In the first place, the schools have been forced to give some attention to the problem of a sane use of leisure time both with respect to the school population and with respect to the adult population generally. It seems perfectly obvious that in the future more attention will have to be given to this problem than has been given to it in the past.

In the second place, the rapid advance of technology and the resulting changes in modes of production and in the employment of labor have operated to increase secondary-school and college enrollment. The American public has become sensitive to the fact that success in life requires a higher degree of trained intelligence and a greater degree of skill than were formerly required. The individual who relies on mere brawn and common sense finds it increasingly difficult to compete with trained intelligence; he finds it difficult, indeed, to find employment of any kind. It is the increasing sense of insecurity on the part of the untrained which has, without doubt, been one of the causes of the rapid increase of high-school and college enrollments.

A third consequence of technological change has been the development of a demand for adult education. There can be little doubt that technological unemployment, either actual or feared, has been one of the chief contributing causes for the development of an adult-education movement which in 1924 enrolled in private correspondence schools four times as many

persons as were in regular attendance at all resident colleges, universities, and professional schools combined. Perhaps the following statement by President Coffman of the University of Minnesota explains in part the reasons for the rapid development of correspondence study in this country: "Literally thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of persons are going to school, not because they are actuated by disinterested motives or a desire to learn more, but because they feel and hope that they may thus escape the clutches of our mechanized industrial order."⁴

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED SOCIETY

There is another social change which has had the effect of materially increasing the demands made on the educational system of this country. I refer to the development of a highly complex and highly integrated society. A generation or two ago the typical American community was a semi-isolated village or town with its agricultural hinterland. In these more-or-less self-contained rural communities life was simple. It was comprehensible, and it was comprehensible in large measure by observation and by direct participation in the affairs of the community. It was not particularly difficult for youth to find occupational adjustment or to arrive at an understanding of the economic, social, and political problems with which they had to deal. But today the situation is vastly changed. The old rural isolation and simplicity have disappeared. They have been destroyed by changes in means of communication and travel, by increased mobility of population, by all the complexities of an industrial, urban civilization. The net result is that today youth live in a society so highly integrated that its political, economic, and social institutions cannot be comprehended directly by observation and participation. If these institutions are to be comprehended at all, they must be comprehended vicariously, by some type of formal institutional study. Thus the sheer complexity of modern industrial life tends to crowd into the schools and colleges an increasing

⁴L. D. Coffman, "Why They Study," *Journal of Adult Education*, II, 260 (June, 1930).

number of youth who can secure even a moderate degree of social intelligence in no other place.

The development of an integrated society, moreover, necessitates social coöperation and social control to an increasing degree. However great may be our emotional attachment to individualism and to the principle of *laissez faire* in government and economy, the logic of events seems to be forcing us in the direction of greater social coöperation. If the democracy of America in the future is to be a democracy characterized by greater coöperation and social control, the school will be compelled to undertake the task of developing in youth new ideals of social welfare and social service. This conception of the school's relation to society does not mean that the school must undertake to establish in youth an emotional attachment to any special type of social or economic organization, but it does mean that the school will seek to develop in youth a social conscience, a willingness to submit to necessary social controls, and to subordinate selfish interests to the public weal.

THE PERSISTENCE OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL

Any one who attempts to appraise the impact of social forces on the American educational system cannot overlook the fact that our democratic philosophy of life is the intellectual climate within which these forces operate. Our conception of the relation of the individual to society is such as to make impossible the maintenance of an exclusive, selective type of educational organization. Unless we change the fundamental principles upon which our democratic institutions rest, our publicly supported schools and colleges must be kept open to all alike, to the poor as well as to the rich, to those of moderate talents as well as to those of superior ability, to boys and girls who will constitute the rank and file of the great industrial army as well as to those who will fill positions as industrial and business leaders or who will enter one or another of the professions. In America we cannot do what is commonly done on the continent of Europe. We cannot maintain a system of public secondary and higher education

designed for the primary purpose of training an intellectual *élite*. We cannot, as in France, for example, take the position that there can be no such thing as a democratic curriculum. When some change in our economy, or some disturbance of existing social patterns as, for example, the change in the ratio of dependents to adults, or the exclusion of children from industry, operates to create a demand for additional schooling, we have no choice but to provide it.

THE POPULARIZATION OF EDUCATION

One of the general consequences of the social changes which we have been attempting to appraise has been the expansion and popularization of American education to a point that is little short of amazing. Each decade since 1910 enrollment in the high schools of this country has approximately doubled until today there are enrolled in public and private high schools combined no less than 70 per cent of the youth of high-school age. Something of the rapidity with which educational opportunities at the secondary-school level have been extended to American youth is revealed by the fact that in 1890 the high schools of this country enrolled less than 6 per cent of the persons of high-school age, whereas in 1935, 70 per cent of the persons of this age group were in attendance at some type of secondary school. Expansion at the college level has been somewhat less phenomenal, and yet it is a striking fact that college enrollment at present is more than ten times as great as in 1890. Today there are approximately as many youth attending college as there were in high school in 1910. At present one youth out of ten of college age is in regular attendance at some type of higher institution. The significance of these figures is that they merely indicate the extent to which educational opportunity at the higher levels is being extended to American youth.

The popularization of education at the upper levels is tearing the high school and the college from their old moorings. It has compelled them to modify their purposes and attitudes, to enrich and expand their curricula, and to cast their struc-

tural organization in a new form. Neither the high school nor the college can escape the responsibility of developing a new instructional content designed to meet the needs and to challenge the interest of a new constituency drawn from almost every type of home, from every social and economic class, and destined to engage in every type of vocation and every kind of profession.

In many quarters America's experiment in popular education is being subjected to a vigorous criticism. Some contend that it costs too much, that society does not have the financial resources to support an undertaking of such proportions. Others are disposed to challenge the fundamental principles on which a system of popular education rests. They lament the passing of the selective character of secondary and higher education; they are critical of the output of the American educational system and are much concerned about the lowering of standards. In short, they doubt the wisdom of a social policy which makes the high school a school for all adolescents and the liberal arts college an institution for students of even mediocre ability. The trouble with these critics is they do not understand how deeply the American educational system is embedded in our social structure. They do not seem to realize that the popularization of American education, the upthrust of an ever increasing stream of youth into high school and college, is the consequence of the operation of social forces over which educational leaders themselves have little or no control.

The school, as we have attempted to show, is particularly sensitive to forces which play upon it from without. But the stream of consequence flows forward and backward continually between school and society. Such is especially the case in a society which is undergoing rapid and fundamental institutional change. [That our educational institutions must play a significant rôle as agencies of social direction and control is admitted by every one, but just what that rôle shall be is a matter about which there is the sharpest disagreement. There are many who would make the school an instrument of

social, economic, and political quietism. To them one of the chief functions of the school is the maintenance of the status quo. They would deny to teachers freedom of discussion of vital current social and economic problems. They would have the school develop in youth an emotional attachment to the prevailing social philosophy and an uncritical acceptance of the order of things as they find it. Members of this group give lip-service to the traditional American conception of a free, democratic educational system, but in reality they are extremely fearful of the consequences of the diffusion of social intelligence. They do not, as a rule, make a direct frontal attack on a system of popular education, but they snipe it from many covers. We are told, for example, that the maintenance of a system of free secondary and higher education imposes upon society an intolerable tax burden. It is frequently suggested, too, that American colleges and even high schools be made more selective in character and that higher institutions devote more of their resources to the cultivation of an intellectual *élite*. In order to prevent the youth of the nation from making a critical and objective evaluation of the workings of our social arrangements, resort is had to a type of emotional revivalism in politics and in economics. Effective use is made of misleading assumptions with respect to immutable laws of economics and of human nature. In fact, those who look with misgiving upon the diffusion of social intelligence are often disposed to cultivate in youth the belief that the whole area of social relations is governed by immutable law. Moreover, we have been led to entertain an undue respect for a curriculum content which contributes little to social understanding but which contributes much to personal prestige. We have regarded the fruits of education as essentially personal and private rather than public and social.

This position with respect to the relation of the school to society is not without some merit. If we are to preserve the racial heritage and pass it on to each succeeding generation, if we are to preserve tradition, if there is to be social cohesion and institutional continuity, the school must be a conservative

and preservative institution. But to make the essential social function of the school the maintenance of the existing social structure can have no other effect than to impede or prevent altogether necessary social adjustments. The danger of such a policy is that it prevents the existence of a self-repairing society and may in the long run lead to the substitution of armed revolt for orderly processes of social change.

A second group, and one which is pressing its point of view vigorously, insists that the school be used to implement such social policy as teachers may deem desirable. The members of this group would have the teachers of the nation formulate a plan of social reconstruction, and they would employ the school as a means of carrying that plan into operation. They would have teachers reach for power and make the most of it. They place upon the school squarely the responsibility of creating a new social order.

With this point of view I find myself in complete disagreement. To carry such a program into effect would, in my opinion, put an end in the schools to experimentalism and to the play of free critical thinking in the whole area of social relations. Those who would use the educational system of this country to develop in youth an attachment to some new and definitely defined form of social and economic organization manifest little respect for the social sciences as objective disciplines, and they manifest a wholesome disrespect for the intelligence of the common man. In the name of a more perfect democracy and a more just type of social organization they would destroy the fundamental principles upon which free democratic institutions must inevitably rest. They would break the present social mold, but they would straightjacket us in another just as rigid and just as difficult to change.

A third group, composed, so it would seem to me, of progressive realists, regards the development of social intelligence as the essential social mission of the school. Those who belong to this group would extend to teachers and pupils alike complete freedom of discussion of all issues and all institutions, the social and intellectual immaturity of pupils being the

only bar to such discussions. They would have pupils trained to gather evidence, to balance arguments, to arrive at critical understandings—in short, to be objective and experimental in their attitudes. They believe that it is the function of the school to make the pupil as intelligent as possible with respect to the social order in which he is to live, but they hold that the school should not press upon the pupil the acceptance of specific plans of social organization or specific formulas for the solution of social problems. A citizenry, so they feel, which possesses a critical understanding of the existing pattern of economic and social organization can be trusted to formulate its own policies and to direct its own future.

This third point of view is, in my opinion, the only one which is tenable. It represents the only way by which the school can be made an effective agency for the promotion of a self-repairing society, a society in which we are constantly evaluating the effectiveness of our social arrangements and attempting to make such readjustments as conditions may seem to require.

I should like to add, finally, that if the educational system of this country is ever to be made an effective agency of social reconstruction, two things will have to be done. First, teachers will have to be given a more adequate training in the social sciences. In the past the scientific study of education has been oriented very largely around the concept of education as psychological process; in the future it will have to be oriented more definitely around the concept of education as social policy. In the second place, it will be necessary to accord teachers everywhere, in school and in college, a greater freedom of discussion. Teachers will have to be made secure from the bludgeoning of "red"-hunting journalists, and from the intimidation of patriotic societies, conservative boards of control, and all others whose prejudices or vested interests may lead them to oppose rational processes of social change.

EARLY LABOR ORGANIZATION IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1880-1900

H. M. DOUTY

I

THE first labor organizations in North Carolina were formed by groups of skilled workers in the larger towns.

At least one of these, the Raleigh Typographical Union, was organized before the Civil War. By the middle of the 1880's the printers of Wilmington and Charlotte were working under trade-union agreements with their employers. The Raleigh bookbinders were also organized. In 1886 the Swannanoa Division of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers held a reunion in Salisbury, and we have the following report of that convivial gathering:

After the reunion the Brotherhood repaired to the Mt. Vernon Hotel, where they were joined by their families and a few invited guests to partake of the magnificent banquet provided. There were sixty sat down at the table. Conversation was rife, and, as one who was present remarked, was properly punctuated with Champaign corks. After the banquet, the parlor of the Mt. Vernon was repaired to, where music and conversation kept the party until a late hour.¹

While craft unions were slowly being formed by skilled mechanics, a larger movement, bearing ideas of brotherhood and solidarity, reached the state. This movement, represented by the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor, was the first to plant in the minds of large numbers of people the seed of a new evangel of labor, and if the movement is now but a hazy memory, this should not detract from its pioneer glory.²

The first assembly³ of the Knights of Labor in North

¹ *Carolina Watchman* (Salisbury), June 3, 1886.

² The Order was organized in 1869 by nine Philadelphia garment workers. Growing slowly at first, its membership jumped from 71,326 in 1884 to 729,677 in 1886; decline then set in, and by 1893 the Knights had almost passed away (N. J. Ware, *The Labor Movement in the United States, 1860-1895*, p. 66).

³ The "assembly" was the unit of organization. Assemblies were either composed of workers in one calling or else were "mixed"; that is, they were composed of workers in various occupations. The assemblies in North Carolina were of the latter type.

Carolina was organized in Raleigh on June 18, 1884, by John Ray, a printer.⁴ In 1887 the claim was advanced that assemblies had been organized in most of the counties of the state.⁵ This is probably something of an exaggeration, and, even if technically accurate, the statement gives a false impression of the strength of the Order. Many of the assemblies were unquestionably weak and short-lived. The movement had clearly acquired state-wide importance, however, with the local assemblies combined into a state assembly, meeting annually, and into several district assemblies.⁶

In 1888 five assemblies were reported in Durham.⁷ Raleigh, in 1886, had four assemblies; one of these, No. 3606, had 198 members in good standing on May 1 of that year.⁸ The organization was active in Guilford County, and in Salisbury, Asheville, Wilmington, Statesville, and Charlotte among other places. Sixty-four assemblies in North Carolina voted in a referendum held by the national organization in 1888.⁹ The movement called forth several short-lived journals, of which apparently no copies survive. One of these was the *Durham Workman*, edited by that versatile gentleman, Hiram V. Paul, poet and first historian of the town of Durham.¹⁰ The *Daily Index*, mentioned as "the organ of the Knights of Labor in this state," was published at Wilmington.¹¹

In North Carolina as elsewhere, the Knights of Labor attempted to organize all of the oppressed. The membership in North Carolina was "composed of male and female, white and colored."¹² While the bulk of the membership was composed of wage-earners and farmers, some small merchants and a few professional workers joined the movement. At one meet-

⁴ The *Minute Book* of Local Assembly No. 3606, Raleigh, may be found in the archives of the State Historical Commission in Raleigh. The entries begin on March 1, 1886, and continue until March 3, 1890, a period of four years. The *Minute Book* is of great interest, and fully deserves treatment in a separate article. The writer hopes later to analyze in detail the history of this assembly.

⁵ *Annual Report*, North Carolina Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1887, p. 224.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 1888, p. 82.

⁸ *Minute Book*, Local Assembly No. 3606, entries of May 3 and May 24, 1886.

⁹ George Mitchell, *Textile Unionism and the South*, p. 23 n.

¹⁰ W. K. Boyd, *The Story of Durham*, p. 251.

¹¹ *Home-Democrat* (Charlotte), Oct. 22, 1886.

¹² *Annual Report*, North Carolina Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1887, p. 224.

ing Local Assembly No. 3606 in Raleigh accepted as members two merchants, two farmers, a salesman, machinist, tailor, bookkeeper, clerk, carpenter, locomotive engineer, blacksmith, stationary engineer, and printer. The applications of a painter, grocer, clerk, merchant, salesman, and two fish dealers were rejected.¹³ At different times a physician, librarian, and minister joined the assembly.

The Negro workers apparently were organized into separate assemblies. An assistant state organizer, presumably a Negro, was employed in 1886 to foster the movement among the colored race. The organization of colored female servants in Wilmington by the Knights of Labor was reported.¹⁴ In 1887 a strike of colored laborers on the Raleigh waterworks occurred. Most of the laborers were reputed to be members of the Knights of Labor. "Our advice to black and white," editorialized the *Charlotte Home-Democrat*, "is to keep out of secret societies and class combinations."¹⁵ A colored brickmason of Durham wrote: "The white Knights of Labor prevent me from getting employment because I am a colored man, although I belong to the same organization."¹⁶

Although no special effort appears to have been made to reach the textile operatives, their first contact with the labor movement was made through the Knights of Labor. At Columbia Factory, North Carolina, the local assembly was composed "chiefly of mill hands and farmers, although nearly every trade, religious denomination, and political party" were represented.¹⁷ The Knights led textile strikes in Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, and Tennessee between 1886 and 1889, but no such interludes ruffled the calm of North Carolina textile development.

The movement in the state was under local leadership. Some of the organizing, however, was done by roving agitators who, depending on collections for their precarious existence, carried the gospel from town to town. One of these

¹³ *Minute Book*, Local Assembly No. 3606, entry of March 22, 1886.

¹⁴ *Star* (Wilmington); cited in *Home-Democrat* (Charlotte), June 25, 1886.

¹⁵ August 28, 1885.

¹⁶ *Annual Report*, North Carolina Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1888, p. 82.

¹⁷ Cited from *Journal of United Labor* by Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

men, a tramp named Hover, appeared in Raleigh, Charlotte, Concord, Hickory, and probably elsewhere in the state in 1886. The first official state organizer was John Ray, the Raleigh printer, who in some way managed to get mixed up with the outcry that arose against the anarchists after the fateful explosion of a bomb in Haymarket Square, Chicago, May 4, 1886.

The facts of this incident are not wholly clear. Boyd states that in 1886 the Chicago police raided a radical center and found, among other things, a communication from one of the Durham assemblies of the Knights of Labor stating that the red flag would yet fly in Durham, and containing a resounding "*Vive la Commune*."¹⁸ One can well imagine the local consternation produced by this disclosure. The communication was signed by J. A. Strickland, a tobacco worker, who promptly repudiated the message and declared that he had written it under dictation.

Strickland in some way connected Ray with anarchism. Apparently this was done in a communication (possibly the communication to which Boyd refers) to *Alarm*, journal of the Chicago anarchists. The *Raleigh News and Observer* for May 16, 1886, brought the whole matter into the open. Ray denied the charge, and Strickland later issued an affidavit stating that Ray had "never at any time given him any reason to believe that he is or ever has been directly or indirectly connected with the socialistic or anarchist party or movement, or that he has held any sympathy with or for their lawless methods."¹⁹ Ray was acquitted by his assembly of the charge of misconduct,²⁰ while Strickland was expelled from the Durham assembly. Apparently there was some effort made to carry on a revolutionary propaganda in the state. Before the Haymarket bomb episode Ray had issued a public notice stating that "certain persons . . . holding public meetings in different parts of the state in the name of the Knights of Labor

¹⁸ Boyd, *op. cit.*, pp. 251-252.

¹⁹ *Home-Democrat* (Charlotte), July 2, 1886.

²⁰ *Minute Book*, Local Assembly No. 3606, entry of May 24, 1886.

and teaching communistic and revolutionary doctrines" were impostors.²¹

In North Carolina the assemblies of the Knights of Labor, except in two or three centers, were never very strong. Nationally the organization reached its greatest strength in 1886 and thereafter declined rapidly. The peak in the South probably came a year or so later, but the decline was equally as precipitous. The city elements drifted away, and the remnants of the farm membership were swept into the great populist wave that rolled over the state during the nineties.

What, then, can be said of the influence of the Knights in North Carolina? Obviously the movement touched many people with its message of the worth and dignity of labor, and of the benefits of fellowship and solidarity. Many textile operatives, tobacco workers, mechanics, farmers, white and colored, men and women came for at least a short time under its influence. That so many assemblies were organized in so short a time plainly indicates that the Order supplied a medium through which serious grievances could be voiced. Though few tangible benefits were won, many problems were discussed, and the idea of labor organization was given some semblance of reality. Local Assembly No. 3606 in Raleigh agitated for the ten-hour day, helped to conduct national boycotts, brought in speakers on labor subjects, encouraged study among its members, aided financially distressed brothers, supported some of the ventures in coöperative production sponsored by the Knights, and attempted to influence legislation. On April 12, 1886, this assembly donated \$30 for the relief of the strikers on Jay Gould's railroad system in the Southwest, and two weeks later Brother M. A. Bledsoe composed and read before the assembly this epitaph on the railroad buccaneer:

When the oppressor Jay Gould
In the silent grave shall lay cold,
And starless night and deathly form
Shall hover o'er the tyrant's tomb,
And his last sleep no waking knows;

²¹ *Carolina Watchman* (Salisbury), April 29, 1886.

While heat and cold, sunshine and rain
Their dominion shall maintain
All o'er the land and o'er the main
The Knights of Labor still shall reign,
Triumphant over all their foes.

The Order was ideologically confused, and its units of organization were ill-adapted for a permanent, deep-rooted movement; nevertheless, the Knights of Labor represented the first great mass expression of labor organization and discontent in America. A letter from a Wake County member of the Knights well expresses the spirit and idealism of the movement:

Let the intelligent workers associate themselves together under the motto, "An injury to one is the concern of all," and "spread the light"—the perfect light of justice, fraternity, and solidarity—and soon the wail of the earth's oppressed and overburdened toilers will be heard no more forever. When the light of knowledge shall have penetrated the black cloud of ignorance which now hangs over the earth like a pall, the sword of Justice will fall and sever the thongs that now bind prostrate humanity before the Juggernaut of the money power. Then will the workers of the world know their power and use it—not to the injury of any, but for the betterment of all.²²

II

With the decline of the Knights of Labor, the field was left to the craft unions. A few such unions, as we saw above, existed in North Carolina before the advent of the Knights. The American Federation of Labor, organized in 1886, represented primarily the interests of these skilled groups.

Little labor activity in the state is discernible between 1890 and 1898. As early as 1894, however, Gompers became interested in the South.²³ Two organizers were sent among the textile workers of Georgia and Alabama, but lack of funds compelled their early withdrawal. At the American Federation of Labor convention in 1898, the Executive Council was instructed to place organizers in the Southern field. This was done, and in his report to the 1899 convention Gompers was able to relate that the "workers of the South are manifesting

²² *Annual Report*, North Carolina Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1889, pp. 284-285.

²³ Samuel Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*, I, 419.

their appreciation of our efforts by forming unions, and uniting with our fellow-workers in all parts of the country."²⁴ Continued interest in the South was clearly shown by the adoption at this convention of a resolution which, in part, read: "... for the purpose of further organization in the South . . . we instruct the incoming Executive Council to use their best endeavors to make some arrangements with the various National Unions to have their traveling organizers coöperate in the work of organization through the South, and if possible to have their organizers on the ground at the same time."²⁵

This interest was plainly reflected in the growth of locals of mechanics and factory workers in many parts of the state. The desire to raise wages—thus reversing the downward trend during the decade—was also a powerful factor in the new activity. A "partial list" of trade-union locals in North Carolina, published in 1901, contained the names of eighty-seven locals in addition to a number of city central bodies. "Organization has progressed so rapidly that we find it impossible to keep pace with it."²⁶ The skilled workers, as we might expect, took the lead in the formation of labor organizations at this time.

Among the skilled groups, the painters and decorators and the carpenters each had, in 1901, six locals, while the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers had five. The machinists, railway conductors, and printers each had four locals; retail clerks and iron moulders, three; bricklayers, barbers, street railway employees, cigar-makers, and printing pressmen, two; bookbinders, electrical workers, plasterers, bartenders, letter carriers, women bindery workers, garment workers, and plumbers, one local each. Six federal labor unions had also been organized. In addition, there was a Building Trades Council (composed of all the unions in the building industry in the city) in Charlotte, and an Allied Printing Trades Council in

²⁴ *Proceedings*, A. F. of L. Annual Convention, 1899, p. 9.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

²⁶ *Annual Report*, North Carolina Bureau of Labor and Printing (formerly Bureau of Labor Statistics), 1901, p. 386.

Raleigh. Four cities had Central Labor Unions. Finally, a State Federation of Labor had been organized.²⁷ Most of these locals had been organized but recently, and their number and variety clearly suggest a vigorous movement toward trade unionism.

While the skilled workers were rapidly forming unions, some progress was being made among the factory workers in both tobacco and textiles. The National Tobacco Workers Union of America was organized in 1895 by nine local unions from St. Louis and two from Wheeling, W. Va. The union affiliated with the A. F. of L. during the same year. In 1898 the "National" in its title was changed to "International" after the inclusion of a Canadian local. During the first seven years of its existence (1895 to 1903), the union formed eighty-four locals and initiated 27,000 members. "That out of the large number admitted into our union only a portion of the membership remains," wrote the secretary in 1903, "is due to a fatal disease that has developed in the trade, called the Tobacco Trust, which has been endeavoring to exterminate our label root and branch. It is backed by unlimited brains and capital."²⁸

In 1899 a local of the International Tobacco Workers, with fifty-five members, was organized in Winston.²⁹ There were at this time 2,500 tobacco workers in Forsyth County. By 1901 there were three locals in Winston, two in Mt. Airy, and two in Wilson.³⁰ Apparently these locals were small and short-lived.

The movement in textiles was more vigorous than that in tobacco. The American Federation of Labor, writes Mitchell, "sent into the [Southern] region organizers instructed to give particular attention to the movement in the cotton mills, and from 1898 to 1901 continued to support the mill unions with leadership and money."³¹ The president of the National

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 388-391.

²⁸ E. J. Evans, "Tobacco Workers," *American Federationist*, Sept., 1903.

²⁹ *Annual Report*, North Carolina Bureau of Labor and Printing, 1899, p. 196.

³⁰ *North Carolina Yearbook*, 1901, p. 135.

³¹ Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

Union of Textile Workers (later United Textile Workers) from 1898 to 1900 was a Southerner, Prince Greene. The drive for the union reached North Carolina in 1900. By 1901 there were at least sixteen locals in the state. Three of these were in Charlotte, two each in Salisbury and Concord, and one each in Burlington, Haw River, Altamahaw, Melville, Lexington, Gastonia, Bessemer City, Spray, and Waxhaw.³²

A weak strike occurred at Durham where efforts were made to form a union, and lockouts took place at Greensboro and Fayetteville. The real test of strength came in Alamance County in the fall of 1900. The struggle centered about Burlington and Haw River. Seventeen or eighteen small mills, all owned by the Holt family or its connections, were involved. The strike lasted for over a month. Evictions, the lack of adequate relief, and a slow market for cotton goods caused the strike to collapse.³³ Active strikers were not rehired, and at other mills throughout the state those in the forefront of union work were discharged. In 1901 there was a brief strike at one of the mills of the Cannon Manufacturing Company in Concord. After 1901, however, union activity in the textile industry of the state subsided.

The young furniture industry was also touched by the movement here described. Locals of wood-workers existed in High Point and Charlotte in 1901.

After 1902 union activity among the industrial workers was almost non-existent for a decade or more. Many groups of skilled workers managed to maintain their unions, however, and thus formed the nucleus of a labor movement in the state. The general movement beginning in 1898 unquestionably served to focus public attention on labor conditions, and the way was thus prepared for the beginnings of protective legislation, especially with regard to the labor of women and children.

³² *Annual Report*, North Carolina Bureau of Labor and Printing, 1901, pp. 388-391.

³³ H. Thompson, *From Cotton Field to Cotton Mill*, pp. 193-195.

ECCLESIASTIC ANVILS OF PEACE

HAROLD P. MARLEY

EVERY MINISTER has read from his pulpit, not once but several times, the old prophetic hope that nations should beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. The time has now come for him to do something about it. Not that the agricultural industry can be saved by having more plows and pruning instruments, but that civilization cannot be preserved unless something is done with the excessive armaments which now burden the nations. Accordingly, pulpits all over the countryside, little pine ones on Main Street and huge five-ton stone ones on Riverside Drive, have become peace anvils from which rhetorical sparks fly in every direction as ecclesiastical blacksmiths forge their sermons.

The modern minister, whatever his denominational label, is anxious to prevent another war, which he believes would end Christianity for all time, if not civilization itself. At last he has taken the peace messages of the Scriptures seriously and has determined to put a stop to this most unpardonable of all sins. But he has discovered that the forging of internationalism requires more than a resolution or two passed in church conventions, "solemnly asserting" as did the Presbyterians in 1924, "that the teachings of Christ furnish the only basis and hope of permanent peace." There is a long campaign ahead, and generals other than the Prince of Peace must share the command. Military men are entirely too adroit in quoting Jesus to their own account, and furthermore the Nazarene has, through his disciples, been entirely too ready to go over to the side of the enemy in time of actual combat.

Charles Kingsley, that great Christian of the past century, when confronted by the reality of the Crimean War, remarked that the Lord Jesus is not only a Prince of Peace, he is the Prince of War too. He is the "Lord of Hosts, the God of

Armies,—be sure of it, for the Bible tells you so.” A demonstration of how easily Christianity may be diverted from loving one’s neighbor to destroying one’s neighbor, was furnished in the last conflict when clergy quickly exchanged their blacksmith aprons for the garb of butchers. As early as 1915, Admiral Fiske observed “that the Christian religion is at this moment being made to exert a powerful influence not toward peace, but toward war.” He was probably thinking of Newell Dwight Hillis, whose Brooklyn pulpit had been such a powerful agency of hatred in the Civil War, who was mentioned by Theodore Roosevelt as the ideal chaplain, and whose cry that “civilization must unite to kill a mad dog” was so enthusiastically broadcast by the American Bankers’ Association. But Hillis was not a voice crying in the wilderness of hate for long, and soon every minister was going into his pulpit and going to Washington to proclaim the same doctrine. Only a few of the clergy in each denomination refused to convert Jesus into a Janus-faced deity, half Christ and half Mars. These, if they have been taken back into the ministry, are the ones who can speak with authority today and not as the scribes.

It would be difficult to find a clergyman today who is proud of his war-like utterances of fifteen years ago. Some easily forget, while others, whose sermons were printed by the Y. M. C. A. or some other patriotic agency, are cutting down this Damoclesian sword which hangs over them, beating it into a plowshare to turn up into the sunlight all the fetid untruths which they once proclaimed with such religious fervor. “We were caught napping then,” said Harry Emerson Fosdick, who served the British Intelligence Department before he wore the Red Triangle of the Y. M. C. A., “but never again . . . I am a Christian before I am a patriot.” In 1919 Dr. Fosdick, still referring to the German offensive as “one of the most shameful buccaneering expeditions in all history,” called upon his countrymen to finish the war by rebuilding the world with the same sacrifice shown at Chateau Thierry. By 1921 he was pointing out that no longer can Christianity and war

be reconciled, and two years later he showed the futility of achieving any ideal purpose through war, which is brought about through a welter of well-engineered lies. His last pronouncement indicates that he will never again sanction or support another war of any kind. The various positions of this outstanding churchman, who has preached to the Assembly of the League of Nations, are pointed out merely because they are quite typical of the devolution and evolution of the clerical mind in the matter of war and peace.

In spite of all the church pronouncements and private decisions which ministers have made since the war, the question naturally arises, Is this mere talk on the part of a profession which makes its living by talking, or has the clergy forged something this time which will hold water? The answer can be determined only in event of war, and it is not worth another war to find out what these gentlemen, who according to the 1907 Geneva Convention need not bear arms in war, would do. Nevertheless, it is likely that they would stand by their guns or rather their forge. Instead of igniting the emotions and beating out the old catchwords, they would probably stick by their resolutions and the radical journals of opinion. Of course all of the fifty per cent or so of war-resisting clergymen would not abide by their peace-time decision, but most of them would. They have already faced their church boards on the proposition, and, as every minister knows, this is an ordeal which exceeds any court-martial. A good many have lost their jobs because they have preached on the subject too frequently or too directly or because they have opposed an R. O. T. C. unit in a high school or college. There are almost as many peace Sundays in the Protestant calendar as saint days in the Catholic. In the spring there are Good-Will Sunday and Memorial Day; in the summer there is Independence Day; and in the fall, Armistice Sunday. Christmas has its peace on earth content, and in February, near the birthday of the great emancipator, is Inter-Racial Sunday. The war department almost set up a Defense Day in September which would have added one more month for a sounding of the peace fugue.

Not only on these special occasions, but upon the opening of a disarmament conference, the flaring up of passions in the Orient, or some other special occasion, the alert minister champions the pacific way of dealing with large-scale squabbles. Sidney L. Gulick in *The Christian Crusade for a Warless World* warns pastors against preaching on this subject too often, saying, "One of the most eminent pastors in the United States, a valiant foe of militarism, preached so often upon this subject that his people became tired and dissatisfied."

It is true that pulpits are for something besides beating swords into plowshares, and ministers have found other ways to express their concern over a world which has been conditioned to wars and rumors of wars. Some of their energy blows off in church conventions. A young man who had been a captain in the infantry and had seen action in the trenches, who was made chairman of a resolutions committee at a state convention of the Disciple Church, raised the question, "Shall I put teeth into the resolution on war?" Being assured support by a friend, he brought in a statement that "we hereby serve notice on our Government that we will never again participate in another war." The debate was long and enlightening, but the resolution escaped the wastebasket only when the amendment "we recommend to the churches," was inserted by some professional buck-passer. Hardly a denominational meeting has been held since the war which has not had something to say on this question. Eight years ago the Methodists in their general conference called war "the supreme enemy of mankind. . . . Its futility is beyond question. Its continuance is the suicide of civilization." But although they were determined to outlaw the "whole war system" they were not ready to adopt the report of the standing committee which said "we as an organization, separate ourselves from war and take no part in its promotion." But eight years make a difference. The modern Vulcans have not been idle at their forge, and now the Methodists, along with several other bodies, have voted to go on the same status with respect to war which the Quakers enjoy.

The inter-church activity along peace lines is even more pronounced. An Inter-Church Conference has been set up which every few years brings together the most outstanding of the peace leaders of the various denominations. It makes a meticulous study of existing conditions and issues careful pronouncements. The leader of the last one has pointed out that the Disarmament Conference at Geneva can resolve the deadlock of technicians only when it proceeds on the basis of budgetary reduction rather than seeking to decide the futile question of what is an offensive weapon and what is parity with respect to the non-offensive ones. There are something like eighty-three organizations of a semi-religious nature which have taken the matter of world peace as one of their projects, some of them giving their entire time to the matter. They circularize church people, and their secretaries speak from pulpits. Nor should it be forgotten that the whole missionary enterprise has been a powerful factor for good-will between the nations. Especially is this true in the case where missionaries inform their governments that they do not want military protection in case their lives are threatened through internal disorder, as a number of them did in China. Any native can understand language of this kind and the cause of amity is further boosted when a mission board refuses to ask protection of its property. The war had not been over very long when churches were taking up offerings to feed starving German children, and soon after that, the child victims in the Volga. Children in the Sunday schools have been tied to children in other lands not only through mission stories, but through an exchange of dolls with Japanese kiddies and Treasure Chests with Mexican *muchachos*. The minister who helped Cecil DeMille produce a moving picture of Jesus did a great deal for the cause of peace, for we have here a truer exposition of what the Nazarene was really like than we do in Barton's book *The Man Nobody Knows*. DeMille is faithful to the utterance that "war means everything which Jesus did not mean and nothing which he did mean." Many ministers have used the slides of *Journey's End* or other

powerful peace plays or novels in their churches, and one has gathered into a homogeneous program called *Red Harvest* representative war poetry written by his buddies in the trenches. There apparently is no end to what an informed clergy can do to circumvent the trickery of Mars and his worshippers. This is seen by such writers as George Dorsey, who in spite of their anti-Christian bias, believe that perhaps the church is the most likely enemy of the sword and spear philosophy.

One of the most constructive substitutes for a peace-time mobilization of war forces has been developed by the Peace Heroes Memorial Society at Cincinnati. Instead of making Memorial Day exclusively for war heroes, a representative Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant clergyman holds a service over the grave of some peace hero, a fireman, a policeman, or an electrician, who has been killed in his field of service. A number of communities have adopted this same practice, and it is easy to see how such a service, carried out with churchly dignity and proper publicity, would be devastating to the old psychology. Ministers have learned that they must come down out of the pulpit and meet the enemy on his own ground. As one looks at the monument to dead soldiers erected by Westmoreland County in Pennsylvania, it is apparent that some local clergyman had something to do with selecting the design. The bronze plate has the prominent scriptural citation "Isaiah 2:4," and the verse is easily identified by the artist's representation of swords becoming plowshares and by the metamorphosis of spears into pruning hooks. With clerical finesse, the expression "a war to end war" has been kept alive on the theory that the military group itself put a stop to the ravages of Mars by making such a complete success of the last war. If it was a war to end war, and for legions it was, we can only keep faith with those who sleep in the poppy fields by refusing to tolerate any longer the institution of war.

Just how far the clergy are willing to be burnt by sparks from their own anvils, how willing they are definitely to part company with the practice of war, is shown by comparing the

results of two questionnaires issued by *The World Tomorrow*. Nineteen thousand, three hundred and seventy-two responded to the eight questions which were asked in the first peace plebiscite in 1931. They represent a random selection from the yearbooks of many denominations, conservative and progressive. The tabulations indicate that the clergy favored the entrance of this country into the League of Nations, three to one, and disapproved of military training in the schools, four to one. Eighty per cent believed in disarmament so sincerely that they thought the United States should take the lead without waiting for the other nations to join in the movement. Three times as many favored abandoning the practice of armed intervention as did not. In line with the equivocating Paris Peace Pact a slight majority were of the opinion that there is a difference between defensive warfare and aggressive warfare, although the eleven hundred students in seminaries who were asked this same question reacted differently. They had been vaccinated with a more powerful bacillus, and a large majority indicate they will not be "caught napping" by this rhetorical germ. Similarly, although the clergy by a slight majority would serve in a war as chaplains, the young "theologs" voted this down two to one. Apparently some ministers who despise the whole war business try to distinguish between war and the warrior, and are determined that the ministrations of religion shall not be withheld from any human being, whatever the circumstances. Others, believing that this is but begging the question, returned their commissions to the government and have worn out their uniforms in hunting expeditions or as leaders of a Boy Scout troupe. Some clergymen still failed to see the similarity of military training in the high school and scouting in the Sunday school.

The thing which made this study front-page news was not any of the above opinions on the part of the clergy, but rather their personal signed pledge that they were through with war. It was the first time that the majority of any profession had set itself up against the state—a slight majority—but, never-

theless, a majority went on record that they would never again engage in, or support, another war. Fifty-three per cent, for such was the figure, is considerably more than the necessary two per cent of a population which Albert Einstein said would stop war, but the number of dissenters in this profession is necessary to offset the lower percentages in less recalcitrant professions. There was only one church, the Episcopal, whose clergy were not ready to take the absolute stand—forty-nine per cent of these apostolic succession ministers saying they could not at present state that they would never again sanction war. Several failed to vote on this question—the most embarrassing of all—so that only thirty-five per cent were with the majority of the clergy of other churches. Probably this proves nothing, other than that the Apostles were all militant, or that the Episcopal church has more money invested in church property per capita than any other. As to the younger generation of the clergy—those who have begun to beat on theoretical anvils—seventy-nine per cent are sure that they cannot coöperate with the government in the event of another war.

The second study of anti-war attitudes of the clergy was made three years later. The 20,870 replies checked and tabulated by certified public accountants revealed the following: The clergy favor entering the League of Nations, almost 2 to 1; taking the initiative in armament reduction, 5 to 1; abandonment of armed intervention, 6 to 1; church refusal to support future war, 3 to 1; personal refusal to support future war, $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. This time only one in seven favored military training in the schools. Those who were willing to serve as chaplains had only a slight majority, and now the majority was in favor of not admitting a valid distinction between defensive and aggressive warfare. Almost thirteen thousand said they could not sanction or support any future war, and again a hundred of these names were published, many being repetitions of the list of three years before.

Comparing the results of the two tabulations, one sees clearly that in the three years there was not only a gain in peace

strength, but there was a broadening of the foundation upon which the peace anvil rests. Whereas in the first the clergy seemed to judge with their emotions, there now was a definite indication of study. To enter the League seemed the course of wisdom in 1931, but its popularity dropped so sharply in the three years that one suspects ministers can be realists as well as statesmen. Armament reduction by the United States was favored a little less, probably due to the bungling of the Disarmament Conference. Armed intervention, however, the mask of imperialism, was knifed for the villain it is, six to one. Non-support of the government by both church and minister gained a little, proving that the men who spurn the khaki are not to be cowed by the bad language of patriots which was hurled against the profession after the first peace poll. A larger percentage have come to see that war is such an abattoir that chaplains have no business going along with a cross, smearing it once more with the blood of innocent youth. Nor are the majority any longer deceived by the righteous talk of fighting defensive wars only. Other indications that the anti-war sentiment is more realistic are the answers to the second half of the questionnaire which dealt with economic matters. In the three-year interval when some Babbitts spoke of the need of a good war to cure the depression, the clergy became disillusioned on the possibility of ever getting world peace without first securing economic justice.

Commenting on the first peace poll in 1931, Rear Admiral Fiske, retired, son and nephew of clergymen, said that the results were no more significant than a reaction of the clergy on the cure of cancer. Clearly they were out of their field when they meddled in the affairs of the state. General Douglas MacArthur, chief of staff of the United States Army, in his reaction was "surprised" that this group, above all others, would repudiate the laws of the land, thus heartening all the criminals and potential law-breakers of the underworld. He too felt that the clerical profession should concern itself with catching its own fish, the individual sinner, nor forget that some of the greatest gains of civilization were won on the

battlefield. Governments must be strong in order to protect the religious freedom of the churches, he reasoned inconsistently, but more than this, there are the plain teachings of Our Lord that "when a strong man armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." "Think not that I am come to send peace . . . but a sword" was cited, together with the reference, in case any minister was a bit rusty on his ecclesiastic manual of arms. So astute have been military men in citing Scripture to uphold their position that there has been published a compendium of Scriptural references both for and against war, together with exegesis. And exegesis is just as powerful in the hands of a clergyman as a hand grenade in the grasp of a soldier.

If these thousands of ministers and these hundreds of ministers-to-be are a fair sample of the entire profession, it looks as though the government would have to look elsewhere for chaplains and recruiting stations in event of a declaration of war. The majority of the clergy are persuaded that neither life nor death, angels nor principalities, flags nor drums, nor any other creature shall be able to separate them from the love of peace which is in pacifism. Sixty-four New York preachers signed a document which was mailed to Washington, saying that they would not "sanction or participate in any future war," and the Ohio pastors of all denominations voted by a small majority in favor of the absolute stand for peace. When Douglas Clyde Macintosh, a teacher of religion, was refused citizenship because he would not say in advance that he would fight in all wars, hundreds of ministers who preach Sunday after Sunday with the Stars and Stripes unfurled in one corner of the chancel, served notice on the Supreme Court that this flag shall not fly above the colors of conscience.

Will these ecclesiastical blacksmiths take the consequences of their action? Will they forge peace weapons in time of war as in peace, or will they once more turn out the same old thunderbolts of Mars? Many feel that the clergy cannot be depended upon to keep their promise, and that these men who exact promises from people coming into the church, young

couples about to be married, and tramps at the door, will fall in line with the same old patterns of mob-psychology. If they do keep their word, an editorial in the *Pennsylvania Manufacturer's Journal* intimates that they will be held accountable, stating that "it is interesting, if not pleasurable, to contemplate the number of telegraph poles that would be adorned by white cravats reinforced by hempen neckties should another war be declared." About the time that an Ohio minister won the national trap-shooting contest, the editor of this journal was sardonically remarking that America would have a new sport, "gunning for clergymen." The enemy which this editor was really gunning for was betrayed in the same editorial when he said that pacifism was especially reprehensible just now when "black souled sons of Red Russia are threatening to overturn the greatest and justest government ever known on earth."

It is not generally known that there are two kinds of war-resisters in the ministry today. The old traditional pacifist is distinctly in the minority. He is the visionary member of a small sect which based its pacifism on sentimental grounds buttressed by the teaching of brotherhood in holy scripture. He will not run cold steel into another man because God has said in so many words, "Thou shalt not kill." He believes almost exclusively in a state of mind "which takes away the occasion for wars," and does not deal with practical situations as they arise. The other type, the pacifist who is in the great majority today, is the minister who opposes war on rational as well as emotional grounds. He has thought the matter through and is convinced that "civilization must destroy war or it will destroy us." His scripture is some such book as *The Origins of the World War*, or the pamphlets of Kirby Page, and his prophet is Harry F. Ward. He believes that Remarque can speak with much more authority on this issue than can Jeremiah or Jesus. He is not a coward, and if he felt that by doffing his citizen clothes and donning khaki, and killing a few men, that the cause of humanity could be furthered, he would gladly do it—not with a relish, but as one who must

perform a distasteful duty and have done with it. But his reason tells him that the practice of indiscriminately killing and being killed by those in another uniform is only letting the blood of civilization, and few want to work in an abattoir unless some benefit is attached. Just as the country of these men, who have chosen an occupation of service to its citizenry, made a new declaration of independence in the summer of 1928 at Paris, a declaration never to seek a "solution of disputes or conflict . . . except by pacific means," so as individuals they too have made the same kind of declaration. They no longer regard nations as checkers on the board of civilization, moving about and annihilating one another. Instead, nations are looked upon as the squares, the spots upon the board, whose boundaries are worn by the ceaseless movement of the "men" through the centuries. War may be a game of chess for army officers, but for the enlightened members of the clergy it is nothing less than a gladiatorial combat. The implication of religion is brotherhood, which means internationalism, and the minister who will never again convert his pulpit into a recruiting station proclaims with Edith Cavell, "Patriotism is not enough, I must not hate anyone."

In spite of the choice dictum, "you cannot change human nature," there is little doubt that the time will come when peace industries will triumph over war industries and submarines will become corn binders. The poverty-stricken country lad will not always look with envious eyes at the poster in the post office which promises him a sleek uniform, travel, athletics, and a visit to strange intriguing ports if he will but beat his plowshare into a sword. Economic determinists will say that people will begin to resent the building of battleships because they are now paying so many direct taxes to the federal government, but every minister will know that his own sparks had something to do with the matter. The Protestant peace bloc will continue to make itself felt in Washington with no more apparent success than the importunings of Isaiah who warned King Ahaz against the way of the sword. Peace parades on Fifth Avenue are as scorned as the ancient prophet

was who appeared in the market place with a yoke about his neck, or as was another who wore only the loincloth of a prisoner of war. What would happen if a clergyman delivered a peace sermon through a gas mask to point his lesson, or if he installed a museum in the corner of his church showing wax figures of unknown soldiers, before and after? In the event of war, modern sons of Vulcan who distrust the ways of Mars, will carry their educational campaign to its logical conclusion and march off to Leavenworth.

That this is not a baseless prediction may be judged from recent incidents where ministers have stood up against vigilantes and other forerunners of fascism. In Arkansas one was framed and jailed for twenty days; in Chattanooga at the All-Southern Conference on Civil Rights, another was slapped by a member of the Legion; and in Michigan one was catapulted into a river by R. O. T. C. students when attempting to speak in one of the nation-wide student anti-war meetings.

There is a stirring negro spiritual, "I ain't gonna study war no more, down by the river-side." Without waiting for war-less immortality, the clergy have so applied themselves to a study of the whys and wherefores of this barbarous anachronism, that they are convinced that no hereafter would be worth enjoying unless we prepare ourselves for it. A young poet retching out his lungs on a strand of barbed wire is hardly a fit emigrant to the great beyond.

THE PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

NORMAN S. BUCHANAN

I

AMID the economic disorders of recent years few institutions have fallen farther from grace than the public utility holding company. Once in high acclaim and their securities prime favorites in the stock market, they have come upon evil days, and the prices of their securities were scraping bottom for many months.

While the small investor has been vaguely wondering what has happened to his supposedly safe investments in these holding companies, certain official bodies have been probing deeply into the whole utility question. Since 1928 the Federal Trade Commission has been investigating utility corporations; and, although the inquiry is unfinished, the Commission has already published more than forty-thousand pages of testimony and exhibits bearing on these companies. Unlike many another exhaustive investigation by the government, however, the utility inquiry has been the inspiration for independent investigations by several of the states. New York and Massachusetts in 1930, Pennsylvania and South Carolina in 1931, have each inquired deeply into the utility problem. Only recently the Federal Trade Commission turned up one or two interesting letters between a state senator and the Associated Gas and Electric interests. The consequence was another thorough-going utility investigation in the State of New York. All told, several millions of dollars have been expended by state and federal agencies in the last few years on utility investigations.

II

The question naturally arises, What have these various commissions been investigating and what have they found?

Study of the hearings and reports reveals that the subject of major interest to all these committees is the holding company and its ramifications.

Now a holding company in its root idea is very simple; it is a corporation whose purpose is to control other corporations, called subsidiaries, by ownership of their voting stock. The holding company itself, therefore, usually owns little except securities, a set of books, and some office furniture. Properly employed and within limits, the holding company is a thoroughly legitimate and highly useful device.

In the electric power industry the holding company first came into use around 1905. At that time considerably less was known about the economic and technical aspects of the power and light industry than is known at present. Before the advent of the holding company the typical arrangement was the individual company, physically and financially independent. But in these early companies service was irregular, rates were high, management was inefficient, earnings were poor, and failure an ever present danger. The early holding companies, once they had acquired control of these operating companies, did much to improve the above state of affairs. They facilitated the raising of the necessary capital for expansion purposes; they improved management; they recast unwise financial structures; and they kept the physical plant up-to-date. By these means the holding companies gradually built up under their control many strong, well-managed, and highly efficient operating companies, capable of rendering good service.

Viewed structurally, these early holding companies were very simple, far more simple to be sure than many of the complicated corporate arrangements so common today. One frequently regrets that they did not remain simple. But it soon became obvious that if one holding company concentrated control and reduced the capital necessary to maintain that control, then a second holding company atop the first would minimize the investment necessary to concentrate control still further. This relatively simple but ingenious procedure has been

adopted and carried to its logical conclusion, until today we have the widespread ramifications of series of holding companies.

For example, if you had lived in Wilmington, North Carolina, in 1929, you would have purchased your electricity from the Tide Water Power Company, which, although chiefly an operating company, was also a holding company since it owned 100 per cent of the voting stock of the North State Beach Development Company. But the Tide Water Power Company was controlled, along with a number of other important companies, by Seaboard Public Service Company, which owned 99 per cent of its voting stock. Seaboard Public Service, a sizeable corporation with roughly \$33,000,000 in securities outstanding on December 31, 1930, was in turn controlled by National Public Service Corporation, which, at the same date, had over \$55,000,000 in securities outstanding. But we have scarcely begun. National Public Service Corporation was in turn controlled by National Electric Power Company, which was controlled by yet another company, Middle West Utilities. As every one knows, of course, Middle West Utilities was a big corporation; in fact, at the end of 1930 it had outstanding over \$255,000,000 in securities, and it controlled, all in all, 8 holding companies, 5 investment holding companies, 2 servicing companies, 2 security companies, and 14 operating companies, some of which had subsidiaries. "Surely this is the end," you say; but it is not. Middle West Utilities was controlled jointly by two other corporations, namely, Corporation Securities Company, of Chicago, and Insull Utility Investments, Inc. The control of these last two companies was held jointly by the Insull family (Samuel, Martin, and others) and the banking firm of Halsey, Stuart and Co.

Although Middle West Utilities is now in receivership, it is by no means an isolated instance of pyramided control; such corporate set-ups are fairly typical among public utility holding companies. The most difficult crossword puzzle is mere child's play, for instance, compared to the job of unravelling the tangled skein of the Associated Gas and Electric "sys-

tem." All told, between three and four hundred companies are involved in a most confusing pattern. Similarity in names and character of business abound. Associated Gas & Electric Company (the top company) is a New York corporation; but there are two other companies of the same name, one incorporated in Delaware, the other in Canada. Similarly there is the Associated Utilities Investing Corporation of Delaware, and another of New York; and still other duplications of names exist. It is frankly impossible to explain the whole corporate set-up briefly.

In the matter of security issues Associated Gas and Electric is even more astounding. In 1930 Associated Gas & Electric Company alone had outstanding 3 classes of common stock, 5 classes of preferred stock, 7 series of perpetual debentures (some convertible at the company's option), and 6 other bond issues with the most complicated and intricate provisions as to priority, rights, contingent rights, exchangeability, etc. As one writer remarks, "It is enough to make the mouth of a Philadelphia lawyer water."

Not a few of our very largest public utility holding companies are mere paper corporations. They have a legal existence in that they are incorporated in some state; but some of them have no more tangible reality than a set of books, certain officers, and a board of directors. Here is Standard Gas and Electric Company, for example, with assets on December 31, 1929, of \$190,926,111.47. Yet Standard Gas and Electric has no employees and no payroll. It is managed and run by its wholly owned subsidiary, Byllesby Engineering and Management Corporation, on a fee basis. In other words, the parent company is piloted by one of its children, which theoretically and legally it owns and controls.

Thus from very modest beginnings and relatively simple corporate arrangements the public utility holding company has become a highly complex organism.

III

Those persons chiefly responsible for the holding company in the electric power industry of course claim many advan-

tages for it. One of their principal claims is the infinitely superior management and service it brings to the operating companies. And in all fairness, moreover, it must be admitted that in certain instances holding company supervision and direction of the operating companies have been highly beneficial.

In the typical supervision arrangement each operating company pays a fee for the service. Sometimes it is a flat rate per month or per year, but usually it is a percentage of the gross earnings of the operating company, varying from as little as one half of 1 per cent to as high as 8 per cent, with about 3 per cent, perhaps, as the average.

Before the depression, new construction in the electric power industry ran into hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Naturally enough this construction work had to be supervised. For this purpose the holding company usually maintains a subsidiary engineering and construction company. The fee levied for this construction supervision has varied from 3 per cent to 10 per cent of the cost of the job. That is to say, if it cost \$100,000 to build a sub-station, the engineering subsidiary of the holding company would collect \$10,000 for supervising the work.

Now on the surface, perhaps, these management and construction services and fees appear innocent enough. But when the Federal Trade Commission looked into them, it found some interesting facts. The examiners found, for instance, that in one company in 1928 the amount collected in fees was 285 per cent of the direct cost and practically the total cost of rendering the services; that in another company, in the period 1926-30 inclusive, the per cent profit on cost averaged 89.8 per cent; while a third holding company received cash dividends on its cash investment in its subsidiary construction company as follows: 1925, 93.3 per cent; 1926, 65 per cent; 1927, 66.6 per cent; 1928, 80 per cent; 1929 was rather a poor year, for then the dividend rate was only 33.3 per cent.

In some companies this feeing of the subsidiaries has been done to death. For example, in 1930 the Rochester Gas and

Electric Company paid as much as 12.5 per cent of its gross earnings in fees to the Associated Gas and Electric Company, or its subsidiaries, for services of various kinds.

But perhaps you may say, despite the profits, these services were extremely valuable to the controlled subsidiaries. This is undoubtedly true in some cases. But consider the following testimony before the New York Public Service Commission:

- Q. Did the J. G. White Management Corporation (controlled by Associated Gas and Electric) perform any services or do anything for the New York State Railways to your knowledge, and if so what, during the time this contract was in effect?
- A. Nothing that was helpful. They did advance the money, but it was not helpful, and a few other things, but nothing helpful.
- Q. What did they do outside of this advance of money?
- A. Called up on the telephone occasionally and asked different information and so forth.
- Q. Did they ever send anyone there to advise or assist in the management of the road?
- A. No, sir.

But since New York State Railways was a controlled subsidiary there was not much it could do. The management contract had to be accepted and the fee (2½ per cent of gross earnings) paid. The same witness quoted above, testified, "I had a further talk with Mr. Pardee, and he said it was their system, and it must be put into effect . . . and I was instructed or authorized to sign it [the management contract]."

All told, these service and supervisory contracts between holding companies (or their wholly owned subsidiaries) and their operating companies have been highly lucrative for the holding companies. In the J. G. White Management Corporation, which we have just been discussing above, the Federal Trade Commission found that the profit above expenses for 1924-29 inclusive was 64 per cent. It also demonstrated that in 1929 the Pennsylvania Electric Co. (the Associated's principal subsidiary in Pennsylvania) alone paid to J. G. White Management Corporation enough in fees to pay the salaries of all the technical employees in the New York office, together with the salaries of the actual managers of the Penn-

sylvania group. In other words, one of the larger subsidiaries alone paid enough in fees to maintain the management service for the whole system. Whenever these service charges have been investigated, the evidence has usually shown that they have been a source of considerable profit to the holding company. In some cases the actual services rendered are of doubtful value, while in others, although the service is genuine, it is altogether too costly.

IV

Back in the years 1925-29, when public utility holding company securities were being so freely offered to the investing public, it was contended that the holding company would be a source of strength to the operating companies in times of stress. Among other advantages of holding company affiliation, it was claimed that the operating company could always borrow money from the holding company at reasonable rates. Thus, while in periods of tight money the unattached operating company might go humbly begging for funds at high rates, the controlled subsidiary would find ready succor in the parent holding company.

It is interesting to learn, however, that not infrequently this borrower-lender relationship has been reversed. For example, in Alabama there was an operating utility, which, on orders from its holding company, issued, on July 31, 1931, \$1,250,000 in short-term notes maturing fifteen months after date. Under the law these notes did not require the approval of the Alabama Public Service Commission. Out of the proceeds of this \$1,250,000 note issue the controlling holding company "took" \$613,000 for which no consideration was paid. A little later, in December, 1931, the top holding company sent down its promissory note for \$400,000 with instructions to the operating company to endorse it, discount it at the banks, and forward the proceeds. Under the holding company-subsidiary relationship no other course was open to the Alabama operating company. The very next month, however, in January, 1932, the top holding company went into receivership, and the operating company had to substitute at

the banks its promissory notes for those of the failed holding company to the amount of \$400,000.

Other cases come to mind. The Arizona Edison Company, a subsidiary of the Peoples Light and Power Company, advanced to the holding company \$555,000 on the latter's 5 per cent demand note. Subsequently, the Peoples Light and Power Company was in financial difficulties, and the Arizona Commission was forced to authorize the issuance of \$1,500,000 in 6 1/2 per cent two-year notes to prevent a receivership of the operating company. The same holding company, Peoples Light and Power, also borrowed over \$600,000 from its Vermont subsidiary, the Green Mountain Power Company, under somewhat unusual and secretive methods. The facts of the case here caused the Vermont Commission to comment:

If the directors of these corporations cannot handle their affairs better than they have during the past year, it is not the function of this commission to aid them in extricating them from their present difficulties.

We find that the Vermont directors, Hill and Gleason, knew nothing about this loan from Green Mountain to Peoples until sometime in August. These officials and their subordinates have worked loyally and efficiently for the petitioner. The pity of this situation is that their efforts have been seriously affected by the domination and exploitation of their operating company by their New York associates. Vermont utilities have no need of such exploitation.

Thus during the depression it has become apparent that one grave danger of the holding company-subsidary relationship in the public utility field is the extreme ease with which the holding company can borrow funds from its subsidiaries. In not a few instances the holding company has been a gnawing rodent rather than a pillar of strength.

V

A few pages back we indicated, by reference to portion of the Insull pyramid as it existed before receivership, how the holding company device facilitates the concentration of control. Ordinarily, of course, control is not desired for its own sake, but for the financial gains it makes possible. Properly employed, the holding company device gives considerable scope

for applying the financial principle of trading on the equity. Briefly this principle is that if one can borrow money at a lower rate than one can make it earn, the rate of return on one's own capital is increased. This is easily illustrated. Let us suppose we have a power and light company worth \$100,000, and entitled by the state commission to earn 8 per cent thereon. Let us suppose, further, that it is capitalized as follows:

\$60,000	6 per cent mortgage bonds
20,000	7 per cent preferred stock (non-voting)
20,000	common stock (only voting stock)

Net earnings of \$8,000 per annum (by assumption) would be divided as follows: bond interest, \$3,600; preferred stock dividends, \$1,400; leaving \$3,000 available for common stock, or a return of 15 per cent per annum.

Now let us organize a company to hold the common stock of the above operating company. Let us capitalize the holding company as follows:

\$10,000	6 per cent debentures
5,000	7 per cent preferred stock (non-voting)
5,000	common stock (again the only voting stock)

Its gross income and its net income, too (since expenses would be negligible), would be \$3,000, distributed as follows: debenture interest, \$600; preferred stock dividends, \$350; leaving \$2,050 available for the common stock, or a return of 41 per cent per annum. Suitably capitalized third and fourth holding companies atop the first would increase the return to the promoters and controlling interests still further.

In actual practice, of course, more than one subsidiary would be involved, the figures would be larger, and probably the capital structure would be slightly more complex. But the principle of increasing the rate of return by the use of borrowed funds and the holding company is exemplified by the above example.

Now as long as the earnings of the underlying companies continue at the original, or at a higher rate, interest and divi-

dends can be maintained by all the companies without difficulty. But let business depression or some other cause reduce the earnings of the underlying operating companies and there is trouble immediately. To illustrate, if in the above example the earnings of the operating company fell from \$8,000 to \$6,000 per annum, the return on the holding company common stock would fall from 41 per cent to 1 per cent.

During the twenties these holding company securities were distributed far and wide to investors large and small. In the past few years, however, it has developed that what were ostensibly bonds and preferred stocks, were, in reality, nothing more than prior claims against common stock dividends, frequently several corporate steps removed.

In view of the foregoing it is not hard to understand the efforts of holding companies to maintain dividends on the stocks of their operating companies at all costs. Many an instance could be cited from the last few years of holding companies forcing their operating companies to pay dividends at rates wholly unwarranted by their earnings. Some holding companies used all the old tricks, and a few new ones besides, to conceal the true state of affairs in regard to earnings and to stave off receivership. But in a major depression skating on too thin an equity proved disastrous.

Unfortunately the failure of the holding company produces serious repercussions which operating companies can scarcely escape. Their forced maintenance of dividends, in an attempt to keep the holding company going, has weakened their cash position and sapped their financial strength; while, on the other hand, by virtue of their known affiliation with the failed holding company their prestige suffers.

VI

Not many years ago Martin J. Insull said, "Regulation of the operating company with freedom of the holding company is to the best interest of the public . . . there is no connection between the security issues of an investment or holding company and the rates for service of its subsidiary operating com-

panies." Careful observation, the depression, and the findings of various official commissions recently prompted the Federal Power Commission to declare: "The Federal Power Commission . . . is convinced that public control of holding companies in the power utility field is absolutely essential in the public interest. In its judgment such control to be adequate would include in its scope the service organizations of these holding companies, with supervision of all contracts between holding companies and their operating companies, and would include regulation of accounts with requirements providing specifically for the filing of financial and other reports on prescribed forms with full publicity. Adequate public regulation would also include supervision of the issue of securities to the investing public."

It becomes increasingly clear that some form of federal regulation of holding companies is not far distant. For those public utility holding companies which have conducted their affairs with scrupulous care and due regard for the public interest (and it is only fair to note that there are quite a number) this is unfortunate. But the public will not tolerate much longer the policies and practices of certain others.

FRENCH AND ENGLISH MUTUAL ANALYSES

GERALDINE P. DILLA

DURING the important sixteen years from Fashoda to Serajevo the two great nations of France and England changed their relations from hostility with the threat of war, to an *Entente Cordiale* with the military alliance during the World War. This friendship may be said to have determined the course of European affairs ever since August 4, 1914.

While the French and the English had never been unobserving of each other since the Middle Ages, they naturally watched, criticized, described, and analyzed each other much more frequently and more seriously during these decisive years of close relations—first as irritated rivals in colonial enterprises on the Nile at Fashoda and elsewhere in Africa and Asia; then as friends of rival powers—France of Russia and England of Japan; and at last as friendly nations vitally interested in preserving a balance of power against their aggressive neighbor Germany.

Their mutual analyses from 1898 to 1914 thus form the material for a useful study of comparative *kulturkunde*, since both the French and the English have proved themselves masters in international interpretative literature, as well as in international politics and diplomacy, and since the simultaneous study of two nations with the comparison of their parallel judgments of each other not only doubles the results but decreases the chance for errors arising from the subjective element in all estimates of others—individuals or nations. Therefore very nearly just portraits of France and of England can be drawn from a detailed examination of historical records and official diplomatic documents, periodical comments on events and on literature, technical and literary analyses—all in both French and English from 1898 to 1914.

It was found that while some of the greatest minds in each nation preserved fairly impartial views of their neigh-

bors even in unfriendly years, yet the very large majority in each nation allowed the political situation to distort their judgments; that is, within reasonable limits, the greater the international harmony, the higher the opinion of the other nation's government and civilization and of the character or mentality of its nationals.

But as nations are moulded by their history, their education and religion, their natural conditions, their economic and cultural milieu, as well as by their racial inheritances, they possess certain traits in greater degree than do other nations, and they exhibit distinguishing characteristic features. Some of these features can and do change with varying speed and in varying degrees as time brings changes in national history and development. France and England have long been closely associated in their history, literature, culture, social and other aspects of life; and they have observed each other with the attitudes of self-interest and of artistic detachment and of the many steps between these two extremes. Moreover, these two nations have left highly intelligible printed records of their mutual observations and reactions, and they have passed through all stages of relationship from hostility to alliance during a half-generation of a recent representative period in world history. Therefore the summarizing and critical study of the Anglo-French mutual analyses from 1898 to 1914 should be capable of shedding a helpful illumination on many political, social, economic, diplomatic, and other situations for some years in the future, where either France or England or both nations or their individual citizens may be concerned.

A survey of the English idea of France before 1898 shows that many English authors of renown made interesting remarks about France, though not always well-informed, such as Sidney, Drayton, Shakespeare, Butler, Pope, Swift, Johnson, Gray, Walpole, Chesterfield, Garrick, Sterne, Goldsmith, Cowper, Gibbon, Burke, Paine, Godwin, Burns, Mackintosh, Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Moore, Hazlitt, DeQuincey, Carlyle, Thackeray, Clough, George Eliot, Rossetti, J. S. Mill, Ruskin, Tennyson,

E. B. Browning, Arnold, Buckle, Sir Walter Besant, Pater, R. L. Stevenson, George Meredith, Swinburne, Watson, Symonds, Kipling. Many English travelers in France recorded their impressions and experiences, among whom the best known were Smollett, Arthur Young, Helen Williams, Benjamin Haydon, and the naturalized British subject Henry James. The most valuable book of French travel was undoubtedly Arthur Young's, for he was an intelligent observer of such important matters as economics and agriculture on the eve of the Revolution.

An early and creditable analysis, rather formal, was written in two volumes by Henry Lytton Bulwer in 1834, and informal analyses in several different books were made by the art critic Hamerton. But the important conscious efforts to survey France as a nation and Frenchmen as individuals were written by the English after 1897. Likewise, the ordinary Frenchman had few reliable ideas of Englishmen before the end of the nineteenth century.

From the observation attributed to Froissart—that the English take their pleasures sadly—early French comments on England seem to have been more striking in style than their neighbors' reciprocal remarks. The authors who wrote most of England were, after Philippe de Comines, Montesquieu, the Abbé Prévost, Diderot, Voltaire, Rousseau, Condorcet, Chateaubriand, Guizot, Michelet, Taine, Merimée, Paul Bourget, down to Max O'Rell. Of these, Voltaire was the most influential because his *Letters on the English* (1734) greatly promoted the French Anglomania of the eighteenth century.

The French idea of England before 1898 was formed from a confusion of three elements: prejudices from an unfortunate past history; brilliant analyses of English government and life by such observers as Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Taine; romantic misconceptions from translated English fiction and verse. For the number of French who traveled in England was smaller than the number of English who traveled in France (even though the Frenchmen seem often to have been more keen observers and clever writers); and the *émigrés* sel-

dom tried to send home to France wholly disinterested or impartial interpretations of their foster-fatherland. Yet the general French attitude toward England changed from Anglophobia in the early centuries to the celebrated tide of Anglomania in the eighteenth century, which subsided into alternate waves of admiration and indignation according to the latest political activities of that "perfidious" or that quaintly heroic England—the mistress of the seas and the shamelessly lucky empire, which in "splendid isolation" held the balance of power in Europe.

While French and English interests had clashed in many places, a crisis occurred when Colonel Marchand was met by Lord Kitchener at Fashoda on the White Nile, on September 19, 1898. Rather than cause a war, the French yielded to the English demands. The history of France and England from Fashoda to Serajevo exhibited a most fascinating combination of the directed and purposeful individual effort of French and English statesmen against what might be regarded as external forces or foreign manoeuvres which pressed on these nations like an inescapable fate. The wise decision of M. Delcassé to bow to the British demands on November 4, 1898, saved the very hazardous situation of Fashoda. Through the efforts of such individuals as Edward VII, the French foreign minister M. Delcassé, and Sir Thomas Barclay, a friendly feeling was established between the two nations; and the agreements signed on April 8, 1904, mark the so-called *Entente Cordiale*. The change in international attitude was shown by the Paris Exposition of 1900 which was at first practically ignored by the British, and the Franco-British Exhibition of 1908 which was their joint enterprise.

Far-sighted statesmen realized that it was the mutual fear of Germany that helped France and England to draw together; the Moroccan crises of 1905, 1908, and 1911 demonstrated both this relation of events and the strength of Anglo-French connections. Yet the French were unable to achieve a real alliance with the English until the World War actually began. The continued strengthening of the "cordial under-

standing" by the inclusion of Russia (and to a less degree, the negotiations with Japan, Italy, and Spain) enabled England and France to oppose the Triple Alliance with a Triple Entente of sufficient strength to make these two historic enemies into Allies after the World War broke in 1914.

The English from 1898 to 1914 tried seriously to "know their France." While making the necessary allowance for the heat caused by national frictions, the student still finds much light thrown on French government, national ideals, statesmanship, and achievement by English writers. The most discussed of these was J. E. C. Bodley, an English lawyer residing in France, who published his two-volume formal work *France* in 1898. Though conscientiously written, this, like others of his books on France, was almost a prejudiced criticism of the Republican government; for Bodley failed to appreciate the difficulties of the Dreyfus Affair, disestablishment of the Church, and other problems. W. L. George, the novelist, wrote a more illuminating appraisal of *France in the Twentieth Century*; and Mme. Duclaux and Miss M. Betham Edwards analyzed French civilization intelligently.

The English came to recognize the French land as very beautiful, their capital as attractive in all directions, their civilization as fundamentally classical and as permeating to a lower level than that of other nations. The Third Republic succeeded in showing her neighbor that liberty, equality, and fraternity were living and functioning ideals; that the Dreyfus scandal and the break with the Vatican were problems solved finally with wisdom; and that French patriotism is essentially tender and Republican. The French demonstrated their peculiar and unfortunate tactlessness in airing their scandals before the world. The strange frenzy of French self-denunciation did not signify French decadence, for the heavy atmosphere of pessimism since 1871 was dispersed by pacific successes and by the Russian and the English Ententes.

While French colonial ambitions had for more than a century found themselves thwarted by the British colonial expansion, yet the French proved able to develop a French North

Africa (Algeria, Tunis, Morocco), the colonies of Madagascar, the Sahara and West Africa, Indo-China, Tonkin, and smaller possessions.

Their attitude toward their colonies and their methods with indigenous races are symbolized by their expressions, "*cette plus grande France*," "African France" instead of "French North Africa," "Frenchmen of color" instead of "lower races." While the monetary profit from their colonies is still doubtful to many of their own statesmen, yet the modern French method of colonization appears to result in more benefit and harmonious prosperity for the natives than does the traditional British method.

The English, as past masters in the art of empire-building, long disapproved of French methods; but gradually some observers commended them, especially such Englishmen as knew first-hand facts from residence in French colonies; and British imperialists learned that France had at last after many vicissitudes arrived as a successful colonial power.

For two centuries after the Restoration of 1660, the social and intellectual relations between France and England were very close. Though by 1898 the channels of communication appeared to dwindle to the theater and the cuisine, yet the increasing number of writers and visitors to cross the Channel showed a revival of Anglo-French influences after 1898.

All aspects of French life engrossed the attention of intelligent British observers, such as the peasant "of independent mind"; the hyper-civilization of all classes; the idyllic regionalism; the echoes of eighteenth-century Anglomania; the French admiration for and delight in scholarship; their pre-eminence in architecture, and other arts; and their alertness to new ideas. Though "furious in luxury" is not so true of the French as of the Americans recently or the Italians formerly, Kipling showed that his vision was remarkably right when he wrote the following about France in 1913:

Yoked in knowledge and remorse, now we come to rest,
Laughing at old villainies that Time has turned to jest;
Pardoning old necessities, no pardon can efface—

That undying sin we shared in Rouen market-place. . . .
We have learned by keenest use to know each other's mind.
What shall Blood and Iron loose that we cannot bind? . . .
Broke to every known mischance, lifted over all
By the light sane joy of life, the buckler of the Gaul;
Furious in luxury, merciless in toil,
Terrible with strength renewed from a tireless soil;
Strictest judge of her own worth, gentlest of man's mind,
First to face the Truth and last to leave old Truths behind—
France, beloved of every soul that loves or serves its kind!

Practically all authorities on nations agree that the outstanding French trait is thought or intellectuality, or alertness to and interest in ideas. All phases of life, from their municipal decorative sculpture to their daily politics, bear witness to the genuine power they give to men of letters. France honors and encourages learning as does no other nation.

Other French characteristics are their extreme individualism, intellectual curiosity, classicism, reverence for tested standards, love of books, self-knowledge, practicality, actual democracy (as shown by the equality of all persons in Paris), love of home and the home-land, industriousness, level-headedness, indifference to small material comforts, mobility of thought and feeling joined with solidity of character, appreciation of the *juste mesure*, economy (which, as they themselves admit, approaches parsimony and pettiness), lack of sentiment in the ordinary affairs of life, lack of concealment of their vices and shortcomings, genuine regard for and attention to women, great respect for the family and its power, lack of self-consciousness, fine critical skill shown in appraising even foreign activities or ideals or figures, true artistic taste and appreciation of art.

These traits are discussed and illustrated in the works of such Anglo-Saxon writers as Ford Madox Ford, Oliver Madox Hueffer, Philip Carr, Constance E. Maud, Edith Wharton, Barrett Wendell, Lawrence Jerrold. In short, the French as a nation show a sane acceptance of facts and a mastery of the art of living—which are characteristic of a distinctly versatile culture and a mature civilization. Perhaps

these are the reasons why "every man has two countries, his own and France."

When the student turns to look in the opposite direction across the Channel, to examine the French opinion of the English, he finds that with the exception of Louis XIV and Louis XV, most intelligent Frenchmen have openly admired the English constitution, political precocity, and practical statesmanship, if not their laws of maritime warfare and their colonial successes.

Almost like an answer to Bodley's *France* (1898) was M. Emile Boutmy's methodical *Essai d'une psychologie politique du Peuple Anglais au XIX e siècle* (1901), which reflected Taine in stressing the influence of natural forces on national character, and which displeased the British.

M. Jacques Bardoux analyzed the English political crises and pronounced British society industrial and urban, aristocratic and religious. M. Marcel Sibert admired "the spirit of courtesy amounting to generosity, which generally marks the relations of prime minister and leader of the Opposition." Mermiex noted under apparent lack of general order the fine political and moral order, the respect for authority, and the determination to secure the liberty of the individual.

More specialized writers on English governmental matters were MM. Adolphe Coste, Charles Dupuis, Achille Viallate, Charles Bastide, Etienne Martin, Philippe Millet, Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu; but, all in all, the successful political freedom early achieved by England remained the outstanding feature of the English nation in the eyes of the French, who from Fashoda to Serajevo were conscientiously and industriously analyzing their old rival or new ally. The peculiar order and stability of the English under their always apparent disorder, compromise, bungling, and lack of logic provoked the French to their most meticulously logical efforts to account for and interpret such a national paradox, while that "bizarre" England resented syllogistic analyses like those of M. Boutmy. The points of more acute international irritation were Egypt,

Morocco, Newfoundland, Africa, Siam, Madagascar, the New Hebrides, the Congo, Abyssinia, and Yunnan.

While Pierre Loti wrote *India Without the English* and practically ignored (except to insult) the English in his *Egypt*, M. Eugène Aubin praised the very sure political and colonial method which enabled the English to absorb Egypt. M. Albert Métin asserted that the British government systematically refused to consider political liberties as articles of exploration to the colonies, but practiced the method of enlightened despotism with more vigor, decision, and success than any other government. M. Victor Bérard wrote a defence of the English occupation of Egypt which was more convincing, thorough, and terse than Lord Milner's.

M. Emile Daireau explained how the English colonial settler never expatriates himself, and M. Joseph Dautremere praised the way in which the Englishman resists the bad colonial climates. M. Gabriel Bonvalot in 1914 wished to see the French colonial system altered after the plan of the British.

The foremost early conception of British colonial expansion was that England was a very great nation which was threatened in her grandeur perhaps only by her grandeur itself. Though for some years the old feeling persisted that France made colonies in order that John Bull might take them, yet the *Entente Cordiale* helped greatly to heal the unpleasant scars of Fashoda and the earlier clashes. France condemned the South African War as did most of Continental Europe. Naturally Egypt and India gave rise to much observation and comment, which varied and which served to point morals to the French themselves. For example, the normal life of the Englishman in the tropics with plenty of exercise was recommended by the French observer to his own people as being more healthful. As the two nations drew nearer together, and as France studied the broad world-view of foreign affairs, she shrewdly compared British conservatism with Teutonic initiative in world markets; and she saw and

warned Britain that Germany was threatening by naval expansion and economic methods especially to undermine the British Empire. Indeed, by 1914 France and England seemed to realize the similarity or identity of their common interests in colonial affairs as well as in European politics.

Though not so numerous, French observers of England itself were interesting writers of their impressions. M. Jacques Bardoux, who noted the war-talk in Britain during the last years of the century, found English patriotism embodied in the admiration for precise groups and determined personalities, and possessed of the synonym "duty." M. Emile Faguet repeated the epigram that France is the interpreter of England to the human race. M. Elie Halévy explained the exceptional stability of English society and said that England is the land of voluntary obedience and spontaneous organization—a free country.

M. Louis Cazamian prophesied well that England would know how to yield sufficiently to the necessity of modernizing her institutions without yielding to it all the time, so that she would remain herself. The pious respect for the Crown was a source of wonder to the French, as were also the Salvation Army, *Punch*, the fog, the religious revivals. As the belfry was the symbol of the French village, so the squire was the symbol of the English village.

It is noticeable that the French always stressed those English traits which were the opposite of their own, as the English interest in their physical well-being, the racial and class exclusiveness which limits their association with their colonists and other peoples, the impersonal interest (free from ill-feeling) in the higher social figures, the superior respect for accomplished facts or strong forces rather than theoretical considerations of right, the desire for immediate practical results and the distrust of theory, the comparative lack of intellectual curiosity—all these qualities contrasted with French traits. The more the French were described as decadent or "inferior" by their foreign or their native critics, the more the

"Latin" French idealized the English "Nordic" as strong or "superior," until international understandings and national recovery in various channels made "France herself again," and neutralized that new wave of Anglomania.

The true description of the Englishman, according to M. Alfred Fouillée, was that supplied by Tennyson in his "Ulysses":

strong in will

To strive, to seek, to find and not to yield—

M. Emile Boutmy assigned to the Briton insensibility but allowed him sentimentality, and said that a "splendid isolation" is natural to the Englishman, who believes that England is God's principal worker at man's task of developing the earth. He is positive and practical, even in his sports, having no love for theory. Finally after a visit to London, the Anglophobe Pierre Loti admired the unsuspected kindness and benignity of the ordinary Englishman. Most Latin observers considered the English people "full of animal energy, rich, grasping, healthy, still urged by appetites and unsatiated by success—rather brutally virile."

Other French observers of the English people were M. André Chevrillon, André Siegfried, Jean Finot, and Paul Décamps. The last-named scholar emphasized the English self-control and sense of duty, and those qualities of individual initiative and personal responsibility which lead to and make easy concerted action on the part of groups of human beings. In short, the French believe that the Englishman, as an individual, is inferior to the Frenchman; but, as a social man, he is superior. He makes a good citizen, and this good citizen has created a great people.

The World War changed the international attitudes of all countries, especially France and England; even Allies could not escape friction. As early as at the Peace Conference, the traditional British policy showed itself—"keeping the Continent divided for the benefit of the Islander," as Clemenceau phrased it. Later, still more differences developed between

the two nations, for "perfidious" Britain long refused to believe that Germany could again become a menace. Even when, as recently, English statesmen show a loss of faith in isolation and think in European terms, it is wise to remember what T. F. Tout, like André Siegfried, wrote: "We must recognize that there will always be an English and a French way of regarding life."

THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA

D. J. WHITENER

✓

THE CONTROL of alcoholic liquors has been one of the most difficult problems ever to confront the people of North Carolina. Regardless of whether one believed in personal temperance and opposed prohibition or favored personal abstinence and opposed interference with personal rights and appetites, virtually every person interested in social betterment recognized in the excessive use of liquors a problem to be solved by the individual, by the temperance society, by the church, by prohibitory laws, or by some or all of these methods combined. No other issue has received such prolonged and, at times, heated agitation. Indeed, if the number of petitions presented to the legislature is to be taken as an index to the popular interest in this subject, then no other issue has received one-tenth as much agitation.

Despite the fact that state prohibition is a product of the twentieth century, the temperance movement had its origin many years ago. This movement, until about twenty years ago, called the "Temperance Movement," falls logically into three great divisions. The first, for the purpose of this discussion, will be called "the regulative period"; the second, "the individual temperance period"; and the third, "the prohibition period."

The regulative period had its beginning in 1715 and continued along with the other movements, which began about one hundred years later, until 1908. Its two distinguishing characteristics were found in laws to punish public drunkenness and in laws to establish a license system. The first is evident in the Great Revival of 1715 in which public drunkenness was attacked by the government. The law provided that a fine was to be imposed as a punishment for each offence, because, according to the statute, the "odious and loathsome

Sin of Drunkenness is grown into common use within this province, being the root and foundation of many enormous sins." The other characteristic, and the more important one, was the effort to control by means of a license system the sale of liquors at taverns, ordinaries, and tippling houses, later called saloons. At the beginning of the system the governor issued the license; later, the county court; and, finally, after the Civil War, the county commissioners performed this duty. Although a fee was charged almost from the beginning, license as a source of revenue was not originally contemplated; but toward the end of the period "high license" was strongly advocated as the best method to solve the liquor question. Tippling houses early became public nuisances; and, as a result, a demand for their destruction arose, causing Governor Johnston to ask the legislature to place further restrictions on these retail establishments. The legislature of 1740 complied by going even one step further; it actually abolished them when it required that liquors could be sold only at taverns and ordinaries. Fifty-eight years later, however, tippling houses were again legalized.

The second period, which had its beginning during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, was the individual temperance period. Although this movement was paralleled by both the regulative and, to a lesser degree at the beginning, by the prohibition period, the emphasis for liquor reform was on a total or partial abstinence, and was expressed by loosely organized temperance societies in which the members banded themselves together by adopting a constitution pledging themselves to personal temperance. Generally speaking, the origin of this movement, a movement which waxed mightily during the thirties and forties, is to be found in the world-wide humanitarian movement of the period, but more specifically, perhaps, in the conviction that the license system had failed to control the abuses of the liquor traffic. Thousands of people at one time or another joined these societies. The American, the Washington, the Sons of Temperance, the Daughters of

Temperance, the Cadets of Temperance, all flourished for a few years and then decayed.

After the Civil War efforts were made to rejuvenate the ante-bellum enthusiasm for temperance societies. The Friends of Temperance and the Good Templars made considerable progress during the seventies, and for a time vied with one another for leadership of the temperance forces. Comparatively speaking, though, the temperance societies played an insignificant rôle after the war. Only the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was able to survive the "roaring eighties and the terrible nineties." These societies were important because they served as recruiting centers for the more virile efforts to solve the liquor problem by legislative action.

The third and most significant period of liquor control was that in which the movement to prohibit the sale of liquor by law flourished. This movement is known today as prohibition. One point should be clearly understood at the outset, however, namely, that no clear or distinct line of demarcation separated prohibition from temperance. In fact, the people who organized and joined temperance societies also led the movement to have the general assembly enact prohibitory laws. Quite naturally, prohibition was always advocated as furthering the cause of temperance.

The prohibition period began in force about 1852 when nearly twenty thousand people signed a monster petition asking the general assembly to enact a state-wide prohibition law. The origin of this demand grew out of the legal efforts of society to correct the evils connected with the liquor traffic, out of the belief that the temperance societies should receive the coöperation of the strong arm of the law in the fight against intemperance, and out of the practice of serving whiskey as bribes at political speakings, a practice that seems to have been both a result and a by-product of Jeffersonian democracy. The theory, sometimes advanced, that the prohibition movement was introduced into North Carolina from a puritanical, priest-ridden New England is a very good theory, but very poor history. A prohibition movement would

undoubtedly have taken place in North Carolina if New England had not even existed.

This ante-bellum prohibition movement was led, broadly speaking, by the non-governing classes, and therefore the legislature of 1852 gave the great petition little or no consideration. After suffering another rebuff from the legislature of 1854, the temperance reformers, in 1856, turned to independent local political action by nominating men for the general assembly on prohibition tickets; they also began to advocate local prohibition, later known as local option. Elections on the question of licensing saloons were held in each school district of Buncombe and other counties in 1858 and 1859. Salisbury held four elections to determine the issue of her famous five-gallon law.

While the Civil War ended for a time these local experiments, it did not greatly retard legal prohibition, and the prohibition movement after the war was a continuation of the ante-bellum period. Indeed, through the drastic prohibitory laws against distillation the war gave a valuable lesson in economic conservation by legal action, a lesson that was not quickly forgotten or easily discredited. The ante-bellum temperance movement had already produced a revolution in the attitude of men toward liquor; during the Revolutionary War liquor was considered a valuable food for the soldiers; during the Civil War its manufacture was prohibited under the theory that whiskey was an unnecessary luxury.

About 1870 the greatest petition movement in the history of the state began. The general assembly was petitioned to prohibit first the sale, and later the manufacture of liquors near churches and schools and in towns and counties. Originally this was an urban movement, but it soon became predominantly rural. Every legislature was flooded with petitions, until, by 1900, most of the rural churches had been made dry territory. After a very strenuous contest in the general assembly with the liquor dealers, prohibition was extended to all of rural North Carolina by the Watts law of 1903 and the Ward law of 1905.

The prohibition movement after the war was primarily a movement to destroy the saloon, the symbol of all the evils of intemperance. Quite naturally the efforts to destroy the saloon, a form of vested wealth, caused the liquor dealers to organize. And, directly or indirectly, this association of liquor dealers in North Carolina furnished the money for fighting prohibition.

The charge, freely made, that the liquor dealers exerted an enormous influence over all temperance legislation almost resulted in their undoing. The manifestation of this power in 1880, when the general assembly, at the request of their association, reduced the tax on liquor dealers and on liquor to fifty per cent of its former rate, precipitated a crisis in the form of a popular demand for state-wide prohibition.

The prohibition election of 1881 resulted disastrously for the drys when their cause was defeated by a popular vote of about three to one. The executive committee of the Republican party officially opposed state prohibition, but many prominent members of that party denounced its action and supported the dry cause. If the newspaper reports were reasonably accurate, the liquor dealers, with the help of the Republican party, were able to rally an almost unanimous negro vote against prohibition. The chief significance of this election was the fact that in 1881 about fifty thousand voters in North Carolina believed that prohibition was the best remedy for intemperance.

The prohibition election of 1881 produced an interesting political situation. A third political party, called the Anti-Prohibition-Liberal party, was sponsored jointly by the liquor dealers and the Republican party. The motive of the liquor dealers was to stop the temperance movement forever, while the purpose of the Republican party was to foster a split within the ranks of the Democrats. The unknown strength of the third party was one of the most important factors in the political campaign of 1882. The new party charged that the Democrats were responsible for the election of 1881, and that they were trying to force prohibition on the people. The

Democrats, of course, loudly denied these charges and pointed out that the third party was nothing more than a tool of the Republican party. Moreover, in order to please the liquor dealers and to detract attention from the prohibition issue, the Democrats, under the able leadership of Senator Vance, launched a savage attack on the United States Internal Revenue System. The third party, however, polled relatively few votes. After this effort to capitalize prejudices aroused in the election of 1881 had failed, the few surviving members of that party were eventually absorbed by the Republican party, and the whole movement fizzled out.

In 1885, resenting the action of the liquor dealers, some of the more politically minded of the dries organized the National Prohibition Party in North Carolina. Professor Horace H. Williams of Chapel Hill, then of Trinity College, was asked to write the platform. The strength of this party immediately became the concern of the Democrats, especially when a Prohibition candidate was nominated for the office of governor in 1888. The Democratic press now pointed with pride to the fact that the Democrats had been in control of the government when the people were allowed to vote on state prohibition in 1881—a stand that was almost a complete reversal of that taken in 1882 when they had sought openly to appease the liquor dealers. The Prohibition party candidate polled but few votes, because, in the opinion of one editor, “the wind had already been taken out of the political danger of prohibition.” This had been accomplished by a local option movement.

The local option method of allowing the people to vote on the question of open saloons in a local territory—usually in a town or county—was advocated as the proper method of attacking intemperance. From 1886 to 1889 North Carolina experienced a wave of local option elections in which tens of thousands of people in most of the towns of the state took part. At first the temperance forces usually won, but by 1889 most of the towns were again wet.

During the early nineties two new developments occurred.

The first was the movement against the manufacturing establishments, called "hell kettles." The second was the dispensary experiment. No state-wide dispensary was established, it is true, but by special acts of the legislature local dispensaries were provided for in dozens of towns and in some counties. These bills in the legislature were bitterly contested by the liquor dealers who openly threatened the Democratic party with defeat if this movement did not stop. If there was any one thing more despised by the liquor dealers than a dispensary, it was another dispensary, and they, therefore, much preferred prohibition. The dispensary movement not only laid bare the innermost secrets of the liquor traffic, but it also broke the political power of the saloons and left the liquor dealers without allies when public opinion veered in their direction.

By 1903 the dispensaries were not proving satisfactory. Under the leadership of the North Carolina Anti-Saloon League, the prohibitionists were organizing for a final effort against saloons and dispensaries. More important, the Democratic party had come to the parting of the way: it must either endorse temperance legislation or it must experience, quite probably, another decade of revolt, fusionism, and Republican rule—all over the prohibition issue. Some of the real leaders of the Democratic party, Daniels, Simmons, and Aycock, understood the drift of public sentiment, and after a sharp contest within the party, they were able to cause it to endorse legislation designed to place further restrictions on the liquor traffic. By 1906 the temperance wing of the Democratic party was in almost complete control.

Under the bold and capable leadership of such men as Josiah William Bailey, John A. Oates, Heriot Clarkson, and Josephus Daniels, the Anti-Saloon League waged a relentless fight for prohibition. So much of North Carolina was under dry laws by 1908 that the next logical step was state-wide prohibition. In response to a popular uprising, the legislature during its special session in January, 1908, called an election

to be held in May of that year on the question of state-wide prohibition. Governor Thomas J. Jarvis, Senator F. M. Simmons, Judge J. C. Pritchard, Governor C. B. Aycock, and other leaders of the State joined with the Anti-Saloon League in this fight.

The prohibition campaign was one that greatly stirred the people of North Carolina, but in no sense was the issue this time identified with politics. One of the most determining factors in the campaign was the almost unanimous endorsement of prohibition by the industrial leaders within the state. The liquor dealers had long proclaimed that prohibition would "hurt business." Now Governor Glenn, leading the dries, ridiculed the pet argument of the liquor dealers by showing that their contention was not only fallacious but even ludicrous. In addition to the whole-hearted support from manufacturers, prohibition was advocated by the leaders of the educational awakening in North Carolina. Aycock declared that prohibition meant "a people calmly, judicially sacrificing their appetites upon the altar of their children's uplift." Again Aycock said, "I have been called the educational Governor, and yet I would rather this matter be settled right, if it comes to the worst, if every school house has to close its doors."

On election day prohibition swept the state. Prohibition received 113,612 votes to 69,416 against, thus giving the dries a majority of 44,196 or a vote of nearly 5 to 3. The dries carried more than three-fourths of the counties. An enthusiastic editor summed up the results in these words: "North Carolina, first at Bethel, farthest at Appomattox, and the first state in the Union to banish the liquor traffic by popular vote—a glorious history."

In conclusion, several interesting characteristics of the temperance movement not heretofore pointed out might be mentioned. The people of North Carolina for more than two hundred years have been seeking a workable solution of the perplexing liquor question. State prohibition was enacted as a result of the long evolution of laws designed to lessen intemperance. Not once during the course of this gradual develop-

ment did a serious reaction occur in the institutional forms of liquor control. Prohibition was closely identified with politics, and often became a leading issue. One of the important factors of liquor regulation has always been the illicit dealer. The enforcement of all regulative laws has met with open and determined resistance, a fact to which the United States Internal Revenue Reports eloquently testify. Although it is true that the clergy took a more important part in the agitation than did any other professional class, the movement was too broad to be called a "preacher's movement." Its true explanation must be sought in the relationship of the white and black races, in public drunkenness, in rural life, and in universal education. The feeling of insecurity for wife and children held by many a man in the isolated rural districts and the ever-present terror on the part of many a mother for the safety of herself and her daughters, must be considered among the fundamental causes of the desire for prohibition. The temperance movement, in its last analysis, was a movement in democracy which could be built only upon universal education for social responsibility.

SOME RECENT CHANGES IN THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

EDGAR W. KNIGHT

AS NOTED earlier,* the curriculum of higher education in the United States since the World War has tended to swing away from freedom of election to a measure of prescription. This tendency has often taken the form of experiments with orientation, general, or overview courses, especially in the social and the natural sciences, and of the establishment of group requirements, major and minor sequences, and fields of concentration. During this period also there has been an increasing effort to guide students more intelligently than before and to adjust the work of the colleges more definitely to their needs, interests, and abilities.

No attempt will be made in this article to appraise or even to describe fully those new college plans which have been so widely discussed in recent years. But the literature of innovations in undergraduate instruction is impressive. Although it is doubtful if any one of the innovations—at Chicago, Minnesota, Columbia, or elsewhere—should be imitated, it does seem clear that these have some valuable lessons for undergraduate instruction generally in this country. The purpose of this article, therefore, is to consider those features of undergraduate work at some of these institutions which appear to have significance for such work in other places.

Since 1918 more serious consideration has been given to the problems of higher education than at any time in the history of this country. And yet it seems partly within the limits of the facts to note that one of the greatest afflictions yet remaining in this area of education is that deadening habit of the academic mind that assumes that what has been in the curriculum is what should be in it and is, therefore, best and must

*"Some Early Discussions of the College Curriculum," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXXIV, 60-78 (Jan., 1935).

remain. The story of the present period reveals how definitely reverential are college faculties for their subject matter and how highly subject-centered are the colleges and universities. Many college faculties still appear to look upon their subjects as ends in themselves. And it is often justifiably charged that too few college faculties appear to view the work of the college as a social function, as a means of social evolution, and as a way toward the betterment of human society.

Since 1918 there has been a definite tendency toward "general education," however, especially in the first two years, for the purpose of relating the work of the college more directly than did the older curriculum to the life needs of the students. This tendency represents an effort to offset the obvious disadvantages that followed the rapid increase of courses during the past two decades, under the influence of the elective system. An examination of the catalogue of any representative higher educational institution almost anywhere in this country shows numerous new courses which cover only a limited section of a field of knowledge and which in most cases proclaim increasing departmentalization. This increase of courses appears as a natural result of conditions that appeared after the World War when multitudes of students crowded into the colleges and universities and when governing higher educational authorities became zealous in expanding their plants and their educational facilities. In due time, however, the economic crisis brought depression to education and college administrators, and faculties were forced to re-examine and re-appraise their work.

Some consideration was being given here and there throughout the country to the improvement of college work even before the collapse in 1929. During the past two decades the literature on higher education has enormously increased. Thousands of articles have been written on various aspects of the subject, associations of college administrators and of college teachers have become more energetic than ever before, and numerous committees have labored almost incessantly over problems of the curriculum, improved methods of in-

struction, and personnel work among students. And the relation of higher education to secondary education has been studied more thoughtfully than at any time in the past.

Courses in so-called general education appear, however, to have begun not from concern of the administration and faculty for the welfare of students but from the interest of the students themselves. Such organizations as fraternities and sororities and religious associations sought to assist entering students to adjust themselves to campus life. The students, therefore, appear really to have taught the administration that they needed something that the colleges were not providing; and the responsibility for "orientation" of freshmen, for example, soon became a recognized function of many institutions.

As early as 1911 Reed College offered its freshmen a three-hour credit course known as "College Life Course" in which the history and purposes of the institution were studied. Brown University about the same time undertook to do much the same thing. A few years later Amherst College developed and offered a course on "social and economic institutions." One of the aims of this course was "to teach freshmen to use the library, read newspapers and magazines, make reports and carry on discussions of live topics and issues." Antioch College offered a course called "College Aims" in which instruction in methods of study was emphasized. These early orientation courses also treated problems of adjustment to college environment and offered advice regarding the choice of curriculum, in an effort to provide a program of guidance, a practice that has now been inaugurated in a great many of the most progressive educational institutions of the country. Some institutions now even go so far as to give advice to seniors in high schools through information furnished by the colleges to the high-school principals. Ohio State University publishes and distributes such information for students who contemplate attending that institution, Oberlin and Colgate prepare bulletins on academic and vocational advice, and Yale

has recently greatly increased its efforts to bridge the gap between the secondary school and that institution.

Just after the World War, whose aftermath stimulated colleges to provide orientation, general, or overview courses, Columbia, Indiana, Williams, and several other institutions began to pay serious attention to the problem of general as opposed to specialized undergraduate instruction. By 1922 forty-one colleges were making provision of this kind for their students as compared with only eleven institutions before the World War, and by 1926 seventy-nine institutions were offering orientation or general courses for standard college credit. Such courses are numerous now and are annually introduced throughout the country by institutions that see the need for basic courses which promise to bring some order out of the chaos which followed the rampant elective system.

In 1918 Princeton established a course known as "Historical Introduction to Politics and Economics." For some time Dartmouth has had special required courses for freshmen which deal with an introduction to industrial society, with evolution, and with physical education. The first of these is intended to acquaint the student with the materials and methods of the social sciences. After presenting a few of the more important forces which have produced the present civilization in the United States, there follows a discussion of some of the more important problems confronting American citizens at the present time. "As far as possible," says a report on the course, "the presentation makes use of the subject matter and techniques of the various Social Sciences. Final judgments, based on the necessarily meagre data which the course presents, are actively discouraged; rather the course emphasizes the complexity of modern civilization and the necessity of long and painstaking study if an adequate understanding of modern America is to be attained. It is hoped that the course will demonstrate the necessity and desirability of further work in the various Social Sciences."

The course dealing with evolution is intended "to acquaint the student with the nature of the universe in which he lives

and the methods of science by which an understanding of this universe has been attained. Specifically the survey embraces the fields of physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, and biology. In each of these fields the subject matter is presented only to a sufficient extent to prepare a background which will be adequate for an understanding of their evolutionary phases. In addition, an effort is made to give the student some acquaintance with the vocabulary of these sciences and some conception of the purpose and significance of scientific investigation." The course is required for all members of the freshman class in either the first or second semester.

Dartmouth places physical education on an equality with other subjects. The course is not regarded merely as a means of training the body but as a vital educational force which will contribute to the health of both body and mind. There are lectures on physical education and hygiene, the prevention of disease, gross human anatomy, physiology and muscular exercises, personal hygiene, dietetics. Attention is given to nutrition and medical gymnastics, to recreational activities, posture, correction of physical defects, underdevelopment and improvement of carriage and the like—"in general, sanitary and moral prophylaxis."

THE CHICAGO PLAN

The new plan inaugurated at the University of Chicago in 1931 grew out of a long and careful study of conditions in that institution. Just as other important new plans in undergraduate instruction, the Chicago Plan has been widely publicized. Rather high claims have been made for its merits. Improvement seems to have followed most of the changes that have been made in it from time to time, and by 1934 it was possible for the dean of the college to assert that the plan, which represents a wide departure from the traditional undergraduate procedure, had been successfully proved.

The success of the plan is doubtless due in part to the time that the institution took to formulate and inaugurate it. The report of the Senate Committee on the Undergraduate Colleges in May of 1928 represented long and laborious study by

a group of distinguished faculty members. A reading of that report alone reflects a most careful consideration of real problems facing the University of Chicago and the determination of that institution to improve its work. Important guiding principles were set out in the report. The essential educational requirements for admission called for "an appropriate degree of attainment in respect to general education" and "a demonstration of the power of independent and informed thinking." The report also asserted that in both general and special education ample opportunity should be given to the students in the first two years to receive "inspiration by work under, and by contact with, men who by their research work are contributing to the advancement of the boundaries of human knowledge." Candidates for the upper two years of the college were to pass five examinations which were to be designed to test their breadth and depth of preparation for concentration after the first two years. Each candidate is required to show that he can write correct, clear and effective English; and performance in writing all of the examinations was to be the basis of judging whether the student had this ability in the mother tongue. The ability to read a foreign language was to be demonstrated; and whether the student had course credits in the language was not to be questioned nor taken into consideration, "since the method by which the student has acquired this tool skill is of little consequence so long as he can demonstrate that he has it." The plan proposed by the report substituted fields of study for course units, made provision for the exceptional student to make more rapid progress, abolished the system of credits for a degree and substituted comprehensive examinations on fields of study or some other method of demonstrating accomplishments, and placed greater emphasis upon the student's opportunity and responsibility for his own education. Several survey courses were contemplated in the report and later established, and comprehensive examinations on three such survey courses were to be passed by each candidate for the bachelor's degree. One of these fields was to be selected by the student as his

major for concentration in the last two years of his undergraduate work.

As already noted, this plan has been substantially followed since its inauguration in 1931, occasional changes, however, having meantime been made in it. In general, broad privileges have been given the students to pursue courses in accordance with their needs, to attend lectures and study as they think best, and to proceed toward the examinations for the bachelor's degree at rates determined by their own abilities. Great emphasis has been placed upon substance rather than form. Moreover, the function of examination has been separated from the function of instruction by the creation of a Board of Examinations, and this remarkable innovation appears to have greatly improved the relationship between the students and the instructor. It is claimed that greater reliability in the measure of the general intellectual achievements of the students has been attained by the new plan of examinations.

The distinguishing features of the Chicago Plan are fairly well known, but they may properly be set out in summary here. The admission requirements are liberal, and the requirements for the bachelor's degree are stated in terms of educational attainments which are measured by comprehensive examinations. One of these examinations is set at the level of the junior college and is intended primarily to test the general education of the student. The other examination is set at the level of the senior college for the purpose of testing the student's depth of penetration in a large but special field selected by the student. The conventional, time-serving, routine requirements of course credits and grades have been given up, attendance upon classes is not required, and the relation between the student and the teacher has been greatly improved, as already noted, by separating the function of teaching from the function of examining. Examinations are in the hands of a university examining board. A full year-course in each of four large fields has been established: one in the biological sciences, one in the humanities, one in the physical sciences, and one in the social sciences. These courses are in-

tended to meet the general educational needs of the students, who have access to carefully prepared syllabi with well-selected bibliographies. A variety of instructional methods has also been adopted, such as discussion groups, personal guidance of students, and the like. A faculty adviser is also provided for each student, and is reported to take his responsibilities seriously, always ready to serve the student as "guide, counselor, and friend." The difficulty with the discussion groups appears to be a lack of skillful leaders of discussion. Many of these groups, when observed in the fall of 1933, were in charge of younger and less experienced teachers. President Hutchins appeared to be in a mood to abandon this feature of the new plan.

Although the entrance requirements at Chicago were not increased, the institution has had more applicants than ever before from students who ranked in the top tenth of their classes in excellent preparatory and high schools. The average score of the class that entered in 1931 on a scholastic aptitude test was ten per cent above the average of the three previous freshman classes, and that of the class entering in 1932 was ten per cent above that of 1931. Dean Boucher reported in January of 1933 that reports from instructors and advisers and from the physicians in the university health service showed that the freshmen of the past two years averaged "higher as interesting and attractive personalities" and better "as specimens of humanity than previous classes."

Voluntary class attendance under the new plan is almost exactly what it was when class attendance was required. In some courses the attendance is even better, while in other courses it is lower than under the old plan. Apparently the students attend the courses when they think that the class period is profitable to them. The attitude of the students appears in an informal statement which a group of them made, but not for publication: "So many able and distinguished lecturers and instructors have been provided for the Freshman courses that we would no more think of 'cutting' a class than we would think of throwing away a ticket for a concert or the

theater for which we had paid good money. If we 'cut' we are sure to miss something of value to us for which we have paid a tuition fee, and the instructors are only interested in helping those who endeavor to help themselves."

Particularly interesting is the increased demand made upon the library. Apparently the students are reading more under the new than they did under the old plan. The problem of the library is to provide enough books and enough attendants to give adequate and prompt service, according to a report of the library officials. Members of the faculty also report that the students show a greater breadth and wealth of reading as a result of the general course.

It appears also that the general courses in the experimental sciences at both Chicago and at Minnesota answer those scientists who insist upon the necessity of an abundance of laboratory experimentation. These general courses in the experimental sciences are intended first to serve the general educational needs of the students and only secondarily to provide training for future specialists in science. Laboratory work is done by laboratory demonstration lectures; the students who are not planning further work in the subject are not required to spend long hours in the laboratory. But those who look to specialization are given intensive laboratory training in the second-year course at Chicago. When faculty members protested against the arrangement for the course in the first year, laboratory provision was made for the members of the introductory class who requested it. But the provision was made on a voluntary basis. About half of the introductory class thereafter reported regularly for the laboratory work. It should also be noted that extra discussion sections were provided for students who expressed a desire for additional provision for the discussion of current problems in the light of principles developed in the four introductory general courses.

According to authentic reports, one effect of the new plan is clearly on the conventional extra-curricular activities, such as athletics, social affairs, dramatics, and publications. There

is now a new competition for the time and interest of the student. Although the traditional activities are not faced with extinction, there is evidence at Chicago, according to the officials of the university, that some of the student activities that flourished under the old plan will die unless they are made to serve more adequately the needs of the students. Those activities which now make the widest educational appeal to the students seem to be dramatics, publications, and the symphony orchestra.

Of course it cannot be said that every student who enters upon the general courses at Chicago, Minnesota, Columbia, or elsewhere turns out to be ideal. Visits to each place and attendance upon these classes revealed a sprinkling of students who were not completely absorbed with intellectual interests. Some were seen to be talking, or reading newspapers, or otherwise paying little attention to what the lecturer was saying. In one class of freshmen a lad revealed to his instructor that the word "heretic," which the student had grossly mispronounced, came from the word "heredity." Nor do these institutions lack "smart" undergraduates. In one discussion group visited, the instructor was trying to make clear the causes of the vernal equinox. "What is the sun doing all this time?" the instructor asked. "Shining," piped up a student. Nevertheless, it does appear that general courses, wherever intelligently conceived, properly planned, and properly directed, have been successfully tested, and that they are meeting the needs of the students more definitely than was the case under the old plan; the new plan at Chicago has also served to remove the affliction of departmentalism which was increasing under the old plan, under which every department was practically a school or college. Now a department or division must study its program and appointments to its staff in the light of the needs of other departments and of the university as a whole, as well as the needs and interests of the students. Departmental autonomy has yielded, and the different fields of study are now more closely related to each other than

formerly, in the interest of the general educational welfare of the university.

A student at Chicago may take one or more of the comprehensive examinations any time these are offered, whether he has attended all or part or none of the courses on which the examinations are set. Most of the students, of course, attend the courses before taking the examinations, but during the year closing June, 1933, some 131 students took examinations after having attended the courses only two of the three quarters. Sixty-two students took the examinations after attending the courses only one quarter, and seventy-eight took them without attending the courses at all. The average of these 271 students was well above that for all the students who took the examinations, according to a report of Dean Boucher.

THE GENERAL COLLEGE AT MINNESOTA

In the General College of the University of Minnesota appear some values which may well be considered. That institution has for many years carefully studied its program, the personnel of its faculty and students, and its facilities in an effort to perform its educational task better and to make a larger contribution in social service and scholarship. The studies which the institution has carried on for a long time have dealt with the "three major and constant factors—faculty, facilities, and students," and also have paid much attention to the individual differences, abilities, and interests of students, with the result that a visitor to that campus is impressed with the immense amount of information that is at hand there concerning every student in it.

The General College is the result of these studies made by committees, one of which was known as the University Committee on Educational Research. Another committee, known as the Committee on Administrative Reorganization, was composed of seven of the deans of the institution, whose task was to propose an improved administrative arrangement. In 1930 a committee was established on special curricula for students who had particular life purposes "in their education

that could be better served by eclectic freedom in making an educational program combining the offerings of several colleges but not meeting the degree requirements of any one." The programs of the students in the special curricula vary somewhat from the standard course work of the various colleges. This special program is known unofficially as "The University College."

The General College was established, first as a junior college, to serve a different type of student, under a separate administrative control and by special curricula. The committee studies had revealed that fifty per cent of the students who entered reached graduation, that in the first two years there were from 1,800 to 2,000 who would not become juniors, and that there were some students in the university who could spend four years there and even graduate, but "who would be equally well served and equally well prepared for the part they would play in their communities by two years of work so directed that it would serve this purpose." The report of the Committee on Administrative Reorganization to the general faculty stated that such a change in the work of the institution would result in a saving of time and money to the students and to the state. In trying to secure these gains the institution recognized the fact of individual differences in students and declared that "no one profits by attempting the same college tasks, at the same pace, or by the same methods as everybody else who has graduated from any high school at any minimum level permitted by any high school." The aim of the proposed reorganization was provision for the fullest and largest opportunity for every student. The students who were to go into the General College were to be those who were not expecting or expected to spend four years in higher education. They would include:

- a. Those who desire to pursue courses or curricula in the new unit that are not offered in existing colleges or who for financial or other reasons have only a limited time to give to preparation for intelligent citizenship in their communities and to general orientation in their choice of, or general preparation for, a vocation.

- b. Those who do not satisfactorily meet the entrance requirements of the existing colleges because of lack of training in specific subjects.
- c. Students transferred from other institutions who do not meet the standards for advanced standing of the college to which they apply.
- d. Students transferred by mutual agreement of the Junior College and the college in which they were first registered.
- e. Those who might not be accepted by existing colleges because of an indicated lack of ability to pursue prevailing curricula.

Provision was also made to transfer from one school or college of the university to another during the two-year period of the General College those students who became adjusted and who showed ability to carry the work of any of the four-year schools or colleges. The administration of the General College was headed by a director, with the usual powers and responsibility of a dean in any of the other schools and colleges of the university, who associated with himself an advisory committee to consider matters of curricula, methods, and teaching personnel. The faculty was chosen from the general university faculty on the basis of fitness for and interest in instruction and guidance of students in the General College. President Coffman gave Director MacLean the authority to draw on the entire teaching resources of the university for the teaching staff of the General College. As a result, some of the most spirited teachers in the institution established and gave courses in the new unit. Some of these teachers now offer courses both in the General College and in the college from which they were drawn. Whenever the best educational purposes of the entire institution are better served, the entire time of a teacher may be given to work in the General College.

The courses are designed to provide the highest service for the students, consideration being given to their general educational and vocational interests and needs. Through these courses an effort is made to assist the students in solving their own problems and those of their own communities. The courses, which are general, overview, and orientation, in the main, are constantly being revised in the light of experience and demonstrated needs. Although the purpose of the General College is to provide broadening experience and training for

those students who do not need and do not desire the conventional college curriculum, the new unit has in no way affected the standards of admission to any other school or college of the university.

THE COLUMBIA PLAN

The courses in contemporary civilization in Columbia College have attracted considerable notice since this work was established in 1918-1919. At that time the faculty of that institution voted to require a five-hour course for the freshman year, in the nature of an orientation course in contemporary problems, as these problems had been illumined by the economic, the political, and the cultural history of Europe and of this country since 1300. The course was formulated by the coöperative efforts of the departments of history, economics, government, and philosophy. The syllabus, prepared in September, 1919, has been revised seven or eight times and has been expanded to include a three-hour course on problems of the present to be given in the sophomore year.

The freshman course, "Introduction to Contemporary Civilization in the West," is prescribed for all freshmen. Its purpose "is to inform the student of the more important factors in his contemporary society and especially to increase his understanding of the economic, political and intellectual background of the present day." In this course a study is made of the European foundations of contemporary American culture, and particular attention is given to the economic and intellectual development of the United States, so as to prepare the student in the sophomore year for a more intensive study of economic and political problems in this country.

The second course, prescribed for all sophomores, is also called "Introduction to Contemporary Civilization in the West." This course, a continuation of the course for freshmen, outlines the organization of the industrial society of the United States in the twentieth century and "presents its technique, distributive mechanisms and financial structure. The effects of the industrial system on particular groups and in-

terests are next considered with special reference to labor, the agriculturists, the consumer and the small competitor." Attention is given particularly to the recent expanding place of government and "the processes by which group ambitions crystallize into public policies." Studies are made of the activities which are gradually being brought within the control of government. Attention is given to the expansion of western influence throughout the world. The course also presents various estimates and criticisms of the present social order, and field work is provided to enlarge and make specific the classroom work. The students are required to visit three times each session representative industrial, financial, and governmental institutions in or around New York.

Columbia College pays much attention to the individual student. Probably few institutions in the country study their students more carefully. In addition to the immense amount of information gathered about them through the Office of Admissions, various examinations enable the officers of the college to discover as nearly accurately as possible the varying interests and abilities of the freshman class, which is limited in number. The freshmen are placed in the course in contemporary civilization according to their ratings on these examinations.

Perhaps the most distinguishing feature of the courses in contemporary civilization at Columbia College is the coöperative effort made in the formulation of these courses. The best advice is used from the departments of history, economics, sociology, philosophy, and government. The instructors of the various sections of these courses are drawn from these departments. The sections are small, varying from twenty to thirty students. A syllabus is followed by the instructor in each section of the freshman course, and the same method is followed in the sophomore course. It was observed, however, that if the instructor came from the department of history, for example, his emphasis was likely to be in that field; if he came from the department of economics, his emphasis would be on the economic aspects of the subject; if he

came from the department of philosophy, his emphasis would likely be in that field; and so on. Also it was noted that the readings and examinations called for by the syllabus were referred to and made as would be the case in a conventional course. The general methods of the instructors varied, of course, in the various sections. Here and there an instructor would lecture a bit, ask a few questions, and provoke a bit of discussion. In another case there would be more lecturing. In still another case it was noticed that the students did most of the discussion under the guidance of a very spirited teacher. It should be noted, however, that the director of the courses, Professor John J. Coss, of the department of philosophy, makes a continuous effort to get and retain for this work the best teachers in the college. These men are invited to teach in these courses; and if they fail through lack of interest or indifferent teaching skill, they are relieved of the work. Moreover, weekly luncheon meetings of the staff in these courses serve to maintain a fine *esprit de corps*. At these meetings individual students are so fully discussed that it seems difficult for a student to get lost or to be neglected.

Here, as in the other new college plans, the success of these courses depends upon the teachers. Those instructors who do not wish to teach in the courses on contemporary civilization are not made to do so. Nor are they allowed to do so. These courses at Columbia are probably among the most conspicuous examples of careful planning and careful direction, both of the material and the method of instruction, in this country today.

Columbia College depends considerably upon examinations. All freshmen must take placement examinations in English, modern foreign languages, mathematics, and physical education. These examinations are required in an effort to avoid as far as possible failures of students due to misplacement in courses. The readiness with which a student can adapt his knowledge to the demands of college work is carefully tested. In modern languages separate aural tests are given. The purpose of these examinations is to determine

where a student will be placed not only in a course but in a section of the course.

Columbia College also places considerable emphasis upon physical education which is prescribed for all students during the first two years of their residence. The purpose of this work is to enable the students to care for their bodies intelligently, to maintain their physical vigor in later years, and to make more effective use of their leisure time. Health, acceptable carriage, strength, neuro-muscular control, bodily efficiency, and endurance are among the objectives of this prescribed work. Attention is also given to those exercises and games which may be of value to the students after they leave college.

The requirements for the degree of bachelor of arts include satisfactory examinations on the two courses in contemporary civilization, on physical education, and on English. Attendance upon orientation lectures for freshmen given weekly during the first winter session is also required. By these lectures, it will be noted, Columbia has extended the conventional "Freshman Week." The purpose of the orientation lectures is to acquaint the students with the history and traditions of Columbia College and "with their urban environment, to give them the point of view of the College in their education, to show them methods and means for their work, and to develop class unity, thus establishing them on a firm footing at the beginning of their college experience."

Any student who has anticipated in his preparatory work the subject matter of the degree requirements or of any other college course has an opportunity to take an achievement test on such a prescription or course. If he reveals a sufficient mastery of the subject matter the prescription is waived, and he is allowed to proceed to more advanced work in the subject. However, the passing of the achievement test does not give the student point credit towards the bachelor's degree.

As already noted, survey courses at Columbia College demand an unusual degree of coöperation by the various departments. Apparently departmentalism has been somewhat

broken down as a result of these coöperative enterprises in which so many of the faculty participate because apparently they have seen the need for providing more general education, especially for those students who enter upon professional studies at the end of two or three years. Through the work in contemporary civilization many students are able to make contacts with important subjects which hitherto were isolated in separate courses. It is the testimony of Dean Hawkes and Professor Coss and their colleagues in this work that these survey courses enable students to gain an insight into many broad fields of knowledge and, therefore, to select more intelligently the fields in which they will later concentrate. It is interesting to report that the number of students who continue work in the fields represented in these courses is twice as large as the number who had previously continued work in those fields.

It has been noted in the accounts of the Chicago Plan and the General College of the University of Minnesota, as well as in this brief account of the Columbia Plan, that departmentalism becomes less stubborn when coöperative courses are established. Not only have survey courses such as have been mentioned in this article proved of great benefit to the students, but such courses also have had decided advantages for the teachers who participate in them. Courses of this sort apparently have a broadening effect upon all of the teachers. A professor of economics, for example, may continue his research and writing in that field; but if he participates in a general survey course, intelligently conceived and formulated in coöperation with other specialists, he must soon realize how intimate are the problems of his own subject with those of other fields of learning; and such an experience must make him more hospitable to areas of knowledge outside of his own specialty.

The new college plans examined revealed considerable acquaintance by the administration and faculty with the facts of American educational history and with changing conditions within the colleges that have encouraged or demanded educa-

tional reform. Among these facts and conditions are: (1) the vast increase in human knowledge in recent decades and the resulting expansion in materials of study and the need for reorganizing the subject matter of instruction; (2) the unfulfilled promises of the elective system which point to the need of changes in the curriculum; (3) the scientific study of man and his education and of the learning process which has called for changes both in the materials and the methods of teaching; and (4) the practical recognition of the fact of individual differences among human beings. These new plans also appear to face squarely the fact that extreme departmentalism is an unfortunate affliction that withers everything truly educational that comes under its shadow and should, therefore, be removed. Moreover, the colleges that have improved their work in recent years have gone definitely from emphasis upon quantitative measures, as revealed by the artificial Carnegie units, to qualitative measures of the individual student.

B · O · O · K · S

CRITICISM OF THE CONSTITUTION

THE NEED FOR CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM. By W. Y. Elliott. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc, 1935. Pp. 274. \$2.50.

To the traditional American plaint that "there ought'a be a law ag'in it" has been added, during the dog days of the New Deal, the new statement of lay objection, "It ain't constitutional." With this popular disapprobation, Dr. Elliott, the young and able head of the department of government at Harvard University, has little sympathy. In fact, he contends (just imagine it!) that the dear old constitution is no longer right and that it is the constitution which should be changed. Boldly this author declares that to obtain social and national security, to make democracy in the U. S. workable, the federal constitution must be revised. He is so convinced of this need that he states "the real issue is not whether the constitution will be touched, but how it will be touched." Vast economic changes, he maintains, make necessary the reorganization of our antiquated governmental machinery that it may travel the new pathways government must follow.

"Government will, in the future, take a hand in business," he insists. "Yet it must be fairly apparent that the new deal suffers . . . from being forced to do sleight of hand tricks with the old deck. It has to try to operate a more complex governmental machine than was produced even by the World War. But it must man that machine by political patronage in order to keep congress from stalling it."

In discussing the need for the reform of the American constitution this author divides his work into four parts. The first section deals with the general recognition of the vital social concern in the operation of business—in the wages of employes who are becoming recognized as consumers, also in the number employed, in competitive trade practices, or in farm prices and the like—which makes government intervention essential in what has been considered the field of private individual economic activity.

To obtain "a workable system of social justice," Mr. Elliott contends, "the state must be able . . . to intervene from within industry as a partner." Consequently he proposes in the second part of his work that government's relationship to business should be that of a holding company to its subsidiaries. The government as a huge holding company should effect the social conditions of all industry through official

directors on the boards of the utility systems and of the great extractive and natural resource industries.

The holding company method is only one of at least four courageous suggestions this work contains. Recognizing that the extended governmental control over business will necessitate more effective governmental machinery, Professor Elliott proposes, in the third division of his work, that the state governments be supplanted in the performance of all major governmental functions by areas of real economic unity, "regional commonwealths." Then, rubbing salt in the wounds of the proponents of states' rights, he adds, "the need for federal control and for stronger executive powers has become irresistible."

Courageously, too, and perhaps idealistically, Professor Elliott proposes "to banish the spoils system." He would accomplish this by means of developing the civil service and by substituting for the president's weapon of patronage in controlling congress the right to dissolve the house of representatives once during his term and require its members to stand for election.

Moreover, this writer contends that "if we are to save the constitution we must amend it in an intelligent, coherent and lawful manner." Besides, he proposes that a constitutional convention be held in 1937 for the purpose of overhauling and rebuilding the constitution in order that democracy may be preserved for future generations.

Finally, in the fourth part of this volume, Professor Elliott discusses the bearing of the international problems of the United States upon our domestic political and economic policies. He contends, as most students of current economic problems also contend, that international security from warfare—economic as well as military—are essential to the economic recovery of this nation.

Professor Elliott's book deserves commendation at least for the refreshing originality of thought and the novelty of its proposed reforms. Unfortunately not much more can be said for it. A reading of this volume does not leave the reader with a well-rounded concept of the need for constitutional reform and the lines of revision needed. Too, it suffers from the author's persistent use of the pseudo-scientific jargon of the college teacher of government. In short, Mr. Elliott has muffed his opportunity.

JOHN J. CORSON, III.

A CONFEDERATE PROBLEM

DISLOYALTY IN THE CONFEDERACY. By Georgia Lee Tatum. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1934. Pp. x, 176. \$2.50.

Among the major problems confronting the Confederacy, and one of the causes of its collapse, was a widespread disloyalty throughout much of the Southland. With the possible exception of South Carolina, no state of the Confederacy lacked a strong unionist minority which opposed secession in '61. This situation had much to do with Virginia's hesitancy to join the Confederacy until Fort Sumter had been fired upon and Lincoln had issued a call for volunteers. West Virginia preferred separate statehood to a war to destroy the Union. A similar feeling prompted a like separatist attempt in East Tennessee. The states' rights construction of the Confederate Constitution by Zeb Vance, Joe Brown, and Alexander Stephens (carrying to a logical conclusion their constitutional theories) gave aid and encouragement to those carping critics who feared that Jefferson Davis wished to make himself King, who denounced the suspension of habeas corpus, the conscription acts, the impressment laws, the tax in kind, the "twenty nigger" law, such laws being simply further evidence that this was "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight."

Aided by recruits who increased in numbers as the war progressed toward an unsatisfactory conclusion and as the Richmond government was compelled (partly on account of this very opposition) to take steps which increased the number of disaffected, many of these critics actively opposed the conduct of the war or at least were apathetic to it. In the first year of the war organized opposition made its appearance in the form of secret societies which existed, sooner or later, in southwest Virginia, eastern and especially western North Carolina, upper South Carolina, northern Georgia and Alabama and Florida, northern and western Arkansas, and among the German and Irish elements in Texas. What were the causes of this disloyalty? To some extent they may be found in the old ante-bellum sectionalism, a matter which Miss Tatum does not emphasize; more concretely, however, she attributes disloyalty to those who opposed secession or who were apathetic in 1861, those whose original sympathy was turned into disaffection or active disloyalty by certain legislation of the Confederate Congress, the conflict between local and Confederate authorities over the enforcement of unpopular laws, the hardships of war, war weariness and the feeling that the contest was hopeless after 1863, and the states' rights peace movement, especially in Georgia and North Carolina. Disloyalty flourished gen-

erally in the mountains, non-slaveholding, and more or less poverty-stricken areas. The question arises, Do not the causes given for this disloyalty apply with equal force to other sections of the not-so-solid South? Were not some of the low-country citizens against secession, were they not aware of the hardships of war, did they approve with unanimity the Confederate government and its laws, and did the war seem less hopeless to them than to their more rugged hill-country neighbors? Perhaps the answer is that in the low country this element was not sufficiently numerous and cohesive to risk a protest.

The Confederate authorities had no end of difficulty with the disloyal and were painfully aware of their existence. Even the Yankees knew this, for they had helped to make it so; besides, they had a not unlike situation at home. Latter-day historians, notably Fleming, Owsley, Moore, and Lonn, have abundantly reminded us of these facts. One may therefore express some astonishment upon encountering Miss Tatum's prefatory hope "that the study will help to dispel the false idea that the inhabitants of the seceded states were a unit in supporting the 'Lost Cause'." It was once true, perhaps, that the shock of Appomattox and its aftermath welded the Southern hearts into one and that any wartime rancor was forgotten in the struggle for white supremacy; also the North, craving greater glory and anxious to classify all Southern whites, except Republicans, as rebels, was not reluctant to foster the sentiment that the South acted as a unit. But that notion could not last forever. Even our textbooks tell the story differently now. Rampant disloyalty and disaffection in the Confederacy should surprise no one; on the contrary, had the South, with its diverse racial, economic, and geographic groups and its tradition of sectional animosity, been a unit in thought and action—then, indeed, there would have been cause for profound wonder.

The author's real contribution, therefore, is not so much a re-statement of the fact that disloyalty existed and an examination of the reasons for that condition, but rather it is in that difficult task of digging up the past of secret, oath-bound organizations, groups seldom highly organized, existing for a short space of time, and composed generally of illiterate backwoodsmen. The paucity of authentic source material is obvious. The main reliance was on the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Newspapers proved almost useless; perhaps it would have been wise for the author to have looked beyond Mississippi newspapers to regions where the opposition was more vocal. On the whole, this is a useful work and as original as most doctoral disser-

tations; if it is not completely satisfying, the chief fault is with the material which Miss Tatum had at her disposal. Students will wish for a better index, a more complete bibliography, and a map illustrating more graphically the centers of disloyalty.

R. H. WOODY.

THE FRANCE OF RABELAIS

A JOURNEY INTO RABELAIS'S FRANCE. By Albert Jay Nock. Sixty-three pen-and-ink drawings by Ruth Robinson. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1934. Pp. 306. \$3.50.

The author of a well-known critical study of Jefferson is also a Pantagruelian. Mr. Nock has qualified himself by earlier work with Rabelais, so that the general public should welcome the present book for the pleasure of such a traveling companion and also for the winning illustrations. A pilgrim to Rabelais-land would appreciate the maps and the aid of one whose feet have felt the soil there. The most engaging part deals with the Chinonais and la Devinière, at which Rabelais spent his early life, and which he magnified in his masterpiece. In following Rabelais's career, our guide traces a wavy circle, not entirely in this order, from Touraine in the heart of France southwest to Poitiers and La Rochelle, then southeasterly to Agen, Toulouse (Albi), Montpellier, Aigues-Mortes, then northerly to Avignon, Lyons, Paris, and down to Le Mans. Tangents lead to the islands of Hyères and to Metz and the Mosel Valley.

The doctrine of fertility—so natural to Touraine—emerges only indirectly. Space is devoted, however, to fleas and the continental dogma on draughts. Here and there occur agreeable essays of passage on water, soap, dogs, cats, and French bread. Little compliments are paid to the humor of Julius Caesar and to the brown thrasher of America. Mr. Nock is captious about Joan of Arc and Carcassonne. Sites of interest he holds strictly accountable for the tourists who swarm upon them. When he declares that he has seen no Frenchman laugh nor heard a lark sing in France, he must have his tongue in his cheek. Despite a disclaimer, he plumes himself on American superiority. In comment, one may recall an incident which took place while a unit of the late war was cruising about the railroad yards of St. Pierre-des-Corps. As a giant locomotive loomed in the distance and thundered toward us, we cheered, "Made in America." But in trampling by, it exhibited an august metal plate, "Made in Belfort."

Sometimes it is difficult to know where to have Mr. Nock. He ap-

proves of neither mountains nor the gently rolling country of smiling Touraine, yet he is aglow about the portion of it adjacent to Chinon. He yields no comment upon the color of the slate roofs visible beneath the royal window seat of the chateau or of the stone ruins above the "silvery Vienne" as it winds through woodland and town. For all we learn, the tiles and walls of Poitiers are of the same hue. Mr. Nock resisted moonlight and the noble Cannebière at Marseilles. Though he dwells on the mediaeval legend of Melusine and digresses for the history of feminism and literary associations such as the sonnets of Louise Labé, he ignores the Renaissance house (and café) of Rabelais at Langeais, suggests no possible connection of the Abbey of Thélème with Chambord, and perhaps deems too obvious Balzac's Rabelaisian tales about old Tours, Azay-le-Rideau, Amboise, and other betouristed chateaux of the Loire.

It is perhaps querulous to expect these things. The author of course alludes to Pantagruel and Panurge with a fond ease. He writes in a choice if colloquial manner, and flings out at certain American smugnesses. One returns to the book with pleasure.

E. C. KNOWLTON.

EARLY CAREER OF A MINOR POET

THE EARLY DAYS OF JOEL BARLOW. By Theodore A. Zunder. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934. Pp. x, 320. Paper, \$2.00; Cloth, \$2.50.

Joel Barlow has for many years been one of the names which the student remembers in connection with a school of poets called the Connecticut Wits, a school whose satires and epics in heroic couplets caught the fancy of verse enthusiasts immediately after the Revolutionary War, and whose names are fixed in the history of their times for want of better ones. His *Columbiad*, revamped out of an earlier *Vision of Columbus*, was the most beautifully printed American book up to its appearance in 1807; and his *Hasty Pudding*, an indication of the rare capacity of certain of our early literary worthies to mingle cleverness and humor in a product which still has the power to entertain. Unlike his fellow Yale graduates who poetized in wailful concert, Barlow became a radical, turned his back on the career of a clergyman, and ended his life in Europe as an agent for the none-too-scrupulous Scioto land boom.

Dr. Zunder has presented a factual, detailed survey of the man's life up to the time of his publication of *The Vision of Columbus* (1787-1788). As a result of the chronological limitations of the biography the

reader is given primarily a history of Yale College in the later eighteenth century, an account of Barlow's brief career as an army chaplain, and a discussion of the literary ambitions and pursuits which marked the fundamental interests of the man until common sense convinced him that a poetical career in the America of the 1780's was utterly impossible.

It is easy to disparage a painstaking presentation of the facts connected with the career of a minor poet—and often Dr. Zunder lacks the *quaedam firma facilitas* of style—but straightforward biography is rare indeed in the annals of early American literature, and so we are grateful for the truth, no matter whether that truth is as bleak as an old New England meeting-house in February. It is to be hoped that Dr. Zunder will some day complete his task, and supply us with the details of the later career of Barlow—details which should engage the interest of the general reader more readily than those set forth in the present opus.

CLARENCE GOHDES.

DESCRIPTIVE VERSE

STRANGE HOLINESS. By Robert P. Tristram Coffin. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935. Pp. 101. \$1.75.

The author of *Lost Paradise* has by birthright the poetic temperament. This autobiographical prose-work made plain that Mr. Coffin knows the lyric moment and has a telling vocabulary. In the descriptive verse of the present volume he has an accurate eye and ear, and the feel and idiom of things in the country:

Or the wild ducks flying taut
Across the water . . .

There are many onomatopoetic strains.

Where the idle harness winters,
The cold hangs in long splinters.

Sounds were getting lonelier and shrill,
A string of sleigh bells hung along a hill.

A crispness of phrase recalls Whittier when he is at his genial best in *Snow Bound* and least inclined to moralize. As a lad in a country church, our contemporary had detected within himself the peculiar behavior of the pastor's words:

Before the sermon was half over,
It turned to fragrance of red clover.

He honestly recalls other Sunday associations with physical discomfort.

He could not separate the thought
Of God from daisies white and hot
In blinding thousands by a road . . .

Along with an appropriate colloquial quality, he exhibits a droll humor, a fanciful touch. An old crow

thrust his body side to side
Bent upon success,
He lifted high his toes and breathed
Gigantic sauciness.

In a new garden-plot

Lady-bugs in party dresses
Were picnicking upon my cresses.

The poet seems most the master and least a rhetorician when he sticks to the small yet significant details of rural life—the soil, stones, animals, birds, insects, to the sensations they give, or to the theme of fatherhood. His footing is less secure when he attempts to suggest grandeur in nature, space, and time, as if he were anxious to impress and over-fearful that without deliberate assertion the mystery and wonder, the miracle, might not become apparent. He almost whistles in the dark lest the order he so much desires in the nature of things might decline to exist if it were not proclaimed. Of lyrical abandon there is little. The poetry becomes most stalwart when it echoes the Old Testament and celebrates the august, impassioned character of bulls.

E. C. KNOWLTON.

PORTRAIT OF A LADY

ELINOR WYLIE: *THE PORTRAIT OF A LADY*. By Nancy Hoyt. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1935. Pp. 203. \$2.50.

In the criticism of art it is now once more acknowledged that a small object may be as genuine a piece of art as an object of grandeur. The principle is to recognize genuineness as the first essential. Thus if Elinor Wylie did not compose great masterpieces, she did nevertheless produce real works of art. In addition, she possessed such qualities of personality as to make some record of it imperative, some representation of her that rings true and fresh.

Those who appreciate her poetry and the romances, *The Venetian Glass Nephew*, *The Orphan Angel*, and *Mr. Hodge and Mr. Hazard*, would seek out as her biographer a woman who knew Elinor Wylie

in person and her environment in Washington, Soamesville at Mount Desert, England, and New York City, and who herself, if possible, is endowed with creative graces. The biographer should prove to be frank, discriminating, and not diffuse. By fortune this difficult order has been filled. Nancy Hoyt, her sister and a novelist in her own right, keeps well to the theme, to what she can vouch for personally. With her humor, daintiness, and a possibly Southern ease and graciousness she must make many a reader desire to become one of the charmed circle. For she is fond of delicacies—like raspberries, which are, she says, "to me more than rubies or plovers' eggs." An atmosphere congenial to the temper of a devotee of Shelley pervades the portrait of the elusive, exquisite lady. In Elinor Wylie nets to catch the wind were not incompatible with delight in frocks in Paris, a delicate greediness for sandwiches, being a good cook, and despite physical pain, a valiant persistence in literary work. Her death comes almost with the sudden simplicity of great tragedy.

Here and there are afforded glimpses of the "welling up" of poems already familiar to us. Seven poems from the first book, the privately printed *Incidental Numbers*, are included, and two unpublished poems written for Edith Olivier. There is also a quatrain of 1919 that one would not care to miss. It characteristically reflects that eye sensitive to tactile associations, to the tints and textures of glass and China, and thereby the cerulean nature of the poet herself.

E. C. KNOWLTON.

CRITIC WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

THE POET AS CITIZEN AND OTHER PAPERS. By Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. New York: The Macmillan Company, and Cambridge, England: At the University Press, 1935. Pp. 230. \$2.50.

A recent important suggestion for higher education in the United States is that, in addition to specialists, there should be professors without portfolio. Such a teacher would not be in the status of a professor of economics who is confined to that territory and is never allowed to trespass on the estates of business or history. Or as a professor of English he would not have to apologize for being rash when he wishes to cite something apposite from Greek, Italian, or German literature, or to come to grips with a general program of living. What a liberal policy may mean is always happily illustrated when a volume comes from the King Edward VII Professor of English Literature in the University of Cambridge. That he is not required to

limit himself to a narrow field within his nominal province is readily seen from such present titles of lectures as "Paternity in Shakespeare," "Tennyson in 1833," "The Earlier Novels of Thomas Hardy," and "Tribute to Ireland." Freedom does not with him entail the consequence that the lecturer is no longer disposed to be careful of detail and fair-minded in adducing proof, as witness his treatment of the dialectal poet, William Barnes.

Definiteness constitutes one of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's tenets of criticism. It may be said of him, as he says of Samuel Johnson, that the reader knows where he stands. He is opposed to any theory that is not constantly put to the test of candid example. His practice is admirably displayed in the two groups of lectures in which he informally guides university students, "The Poet as Citizen" and "First Aid in Criticism." He is abreast of the times in tilting with Mr. T. S. Eliot, whom he recognizes as a stout opponent. In the mind of some readers may arise a mischievous notion. What if some day there appears in the lists a creative knight who is as certain of his inner check as Mr. Eliot is of his monitor! Who could decide between the two illuminations when they are put to the ordeal?

It is dispiriting to be reminded by Sir Arthur's easy allusions to Plato and Aristotle, and to them even in the original, that the Cambridge undergraduate may possess a knowledge of Greek quite impossible in America where Greek is not only not required in high schools for college preparation but has practically vanished from them. An American undergraduate can scarcely feel at home with the old principle of harmony which means so much to Sir Arthur. He cannot realize how natural it is, how like an organism it can adapt itself to a changing world, and yet preserve its essential integrity. In fact, he has to forego a chief blessing of well-tested tradition, namely, the sense of freedom which arises from knowing that beneath one lies a firm foundation, that one's energy need not be dissipated in finding that sort of base, and thus may be devoted to adapting the individual superstructure to it.

E. C. KNOWLTON.

CHAMBERLAIN AT HIS HEIGHT

THE LIFE OF JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN. By J. L. Garvin. New York and London: The Macmillan Company, 1934. Vol. III. Pp. ix, 632. \$6.00.

In this third instalment of his comprehensive biography the author accounts for the last five years of the nineteenth century, the years at the Colonial Office in which Chamberlain reached the peak of his career.

In these years Mr. Garvin finds his to have been the guiding hand in shaping Britain's policy concerning empire and foreign relations. The policy was not premeditated; the events were largely unforeseen. Between Chamberlain and Rhodes was an antipathy, so far were they from conspiring together as was alleged. The Jameson Raid was a "calamity" to Chamberlain's hopes and changed the outlook of his "world." The clash with Kruger followed in spite of his earnest efforts to promote a peaceful settlement.

Meantime, he lent a soothing hand on the question of the Venezuelan boundary. He tried to make friends with Germany, distrusting France, but was thwarted by the Kaiser. Slower than Milner to conclude that force was necessary, he was the moving spirit in carrying on the war after it was begun, though he ever looked forward to extenuating terms at its end. He piloted through Parliament the bill for instituting the Australian Commonwealth. He urged the dissolution of Parliament and the ensuing "Khaki election" in order to gain time for the government to carry forward the program he had in mind. At that point the author leaves his hero on the threshold of a period of frustration and strife.

Mr. Garvin writes in this volume with less restraint than in his previous two and with a freer use of documents, feeling apparently surer of his case. Historians in the future will use his book, whether or not they agree with all the points he makes. The disagreement will probably rather be with the details than with the larger outline. The volume is further evidence that the Chamberlain family did well to entrust its papers to Mr. Garvin.

W. T. LAPRADE.

BOOKS WITH KINDRED PURPOSE

LOST PARADISE. By Robert P. Tristram Coffin. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. Pp. 284. \$2.50.

THE WHITE HILLS. By Cornelius Weygandt. Illustrated. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1934. Pp. 389. \$3.50.

A kindred purpose links *Lost Paradise* and *The White Hills*—to celebrate what life has been in a portion of a New England state. The former book, from a well-known essayist and college professor, recreates what a small boy experienced in a farming district on the Maine coast near Pemaquid. The latter reports what another distinguished professor, atavistically-minded, he says, could gather in many years about the Sandwich-mountain region in New Hampshire. Contacts with

earth, water, and weather, raciness, sense for character and human nature, observations on Puritanism, humor, and poetry mark both works. In *The White Hills* is a remarkably penetrating criticism of Robert Frost's poetry; in *Lost Paradise*, a moving reflection of the environment that was making a poet of the boy Peter. Wild flowers and animals bestrew the pages. Both writers have sharp eyes: spiders, fringed gentians, rose pogonias, freckle lilies, hardhack, bird-on-the-wing, pileated woodpecker, skunks, many kinds of game. If Mr. Coffin holds forth on morning-glories, sweet potatoes, robin runaway, starfish, Kickapoo pamphlets, shipping turnips on a November night over water, Mr. Weygandt lingers over Indian heritages, stone walls, the maple and its functions, snappers, Lombardy poplars, highbush cranberries, granite, Stoddard glass, and apples. They supplement each other in knowledge and spirit. Either author might have written, "Uncle Thomas was full of Original Sin, and he didn't know Original Sin from his own big hands and big moustache."

E. C. KNOWLTON.

PHILOSOPHY AND A POET

THE INTELLECTUAL MILIEU OF JOHN DRYDEN: *Studies in Some Aspects of Seventeenth Century Thought*. By Louis I. Bredvold. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1934. Pp. viii, 189.

In this well-reasoned monograph Professor Bredvold undertakes to explain Dryden's adaptability to the prevailing religion of the ruling groups in England in his day as in part the product of a philosophical skepticism which tends in all times to produce conservatism as one of its fruits. An estimate of the poet's character in the Introduction reveals that he felt the need of wide learning as a preparation for writing the epic he planned. The three succeeding chapters deal with the Traditions of Skepticism, the Crisis of the New Science, and Roman Catholic Apologetics in England. The theme is the similarity of the Roman Catholic apologetics with Pyrrhonism, traceable from Classical times through the middle ages to Montaigne in the sixteenth century and Pascal in the seventeenth. The fifth chapter is concerned with "Toryism," especially as it pertained to Dryden. Without discounting the accuracy of the philosophical story and admitting that some of the arguments recounted may have been used to rationalize positions taken, one may still doubt whether the poet arrived at his attitudes by the paths this study would seem to suggest.

W. T. LAPRADE.

